ORIGINAL

1	REPORTER'S RECORD 7001.0
2	VOLUME 49 OF <u>5/</u>
3	TRIAL COURT CAUSE NO. 241-0978-04
4	
5	THE STATE OF TEXAS * IN THE DISTRICT COURT
6	VERSUS * SMITH COUNTY, TEXAS
7	TRACY BEATTY * 241ST JUDICIAL DISTRICT
8	
9	
10	
11	PUNISHMENT PHASE
12	AUGUST 10, 2004
13	
14	COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS
15	JUN 142005
16	Troy C. Bonnett, Jr., Clerk
17	
18	On the 10th day of August, 2004, the following
19	proceedings came on to be heard in the above-entitled and
20	numbered cause before the HONORABLE JACK SKEEN, JR., Judge
21	Presiding, held in Tyler, Smith County, Texas:
22	
23	Proceedings reported by computerized stenotype machine;
24	Reporter's record produced by computer-assisted
25	transcription.

		2
1	APPEARANCES	
2	MR. D. MATT BINGHAM, III State Bar Number 00787085	
3	Smith County Criminal District Attorney	
4	MR. J. BRETT HARRISON State Bar Number 00793909	
5	MS. APRIL SIKES State Bar Number 18348790	
6	Assistant Smith County District Attorneys Smith County Courthouse, Fourth Floor	
7	Tyler, Texas 75702 Telephone: 903.535.0520	
8	Fax: 903.535.0599	
9	REPRESENTING THE STATE OF TEXAS	
10	MR. ROBERT C. PERKINS, JR.	
11	State Bar Number 15790405 MR. KENNETH HAWK	
12	State Bar Number 09243650 Attorneys at Law	
13	112 East Line Street, Suite 202 Tyler, Texas 75702	
14	Telephone: 903.593.7780	
15	REPRESENTING THE DEFENDANT	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21	REPORTER'S NOTE	
22	Uh-huh = Yes - Affirmative response	
23	Huh-uh = No - Negative response	
24	Quotation marks are used for clarity and do not necessari indicate a direct quote.	ly
25		

		3
1	INDEX	
2	VOLUME 49 OF	
3	(PUNISHMENT PHASE)	
4	PAGE	VOL
5	AUGUST 10, 2004	
6	OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:	
7	Objections to the charge4	49
8	IN THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:	
9	Defense rests18	49
10	Both sides close18	49
11	Charge read19	49
12	Closing argument by Ms. Sikes31	49
13	Closing argument by Mr. Perkins49	49
14	Rebuttal argument by Mr. Bingham68	49
15	Jury deliberations85	49
16	Verdict86	49
17	Jury discharged88	49
18	Sentencing101	49
19	Court Reporter's Certificate104	49
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

4 PROCEEDINGS 1 2 (August 10, 2004) 3 (Open court, defendant present, no jury.) 4 THE COURT: Back on the record in Cause Number 241-0978-04, the State of Texas versus Tracy Beatty. 5 6 The State is present; defense counsel are present; the 7 defendant is present. 8 The Court has before it a proposed charge of 9 the Court to give to the jury. 10 The jury, of course, is not in the courtroom. 11 And at this time, has the State had an 12 opportunity to review the proposed charge which has been 13 submitted to the Court to read to the jury on sentencing? 14 MR. BINGHAM: Judge, we have. 15 THE COURT: Does the State have any 16 objections to the charge as prepared for the Court to read 17 to the jury? 18 MR. BINGHAM: We do not. 19 THE COURT: Mr. Perkins -- or Mr. Hawk, in 20 regard to the proposed charge of the Court to be read to the 21 jury -- well, the Court has several written objections from 22 the Defense and also a request for an instruction from the 23 Defense. 24 Do you want to go on through those? 25 MR. HAWK: I will, Judge.

1.4

First of all, I'm making a presumption here.

I think the Court might have said this earlier -- I'm not sure of that -- even though the Defense has not yet rested before the jury, we anticipate that happening when we come back. So I would make the presumption that our objections in this charge conference would be the same were we to bring the jury in, rest, and we send them right back out.

Is that an appropriate presumption?

THE COURT: That is -- you have accurately described the situation. The Court being aware as what I know right now is about to take place. If the Court brings the jury in, and then that takes place, I would just send the jury right back out after about 30 seconds. And then we would go through this charging conference.

So you have accurately described what the Court plans to do is complete the charging conference, allow you to make your objections on the record and through your written motions that the Court will rule on. And then at that point, once we have the charge in final form and the Court knows how much the State and Defense are requesting for argument, then the Court will bring the jury in.

And if there is not some change in what the Court anticipates will take place, then the case would be argued and submitted to the jury. So you've accurately stated that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

charge is read to the jury.

THE COURT:

6 MR. HAWK: Well, in that case, then here's what we'll do. If I can go through this, I'll try to do this fairly sequentially. We are going to at this time, prior to the time that the charge is read to the jury, reurge the motions that were filed pretrial that the Court preclude the prosecution receiving the death penalty, that the Court declare the capital sentencing scheme unconstitutional and preclude the death penalty on that basis, and for the Court to hold 37.071 unconstitutional. Those three motions were filed back in April 13th and ruled by the Court -- or were submitted for its ruling on June the 18th. I believe the Court has already stated in the record that you've denied those motions, but we have to reurge those three specific motions at this time. THE COURT: That's right. The Court has earlier denied those motions, and the Court will again deny those motions that you just enumerated for the record at this time. MR. HAWK: We also would reurge all of our objections that we made at the quilt/innocence phase of trial to the evidence anytime it was offered. We want to renew those objections at this time prior to the time the

And the Court's rulings on your

7 1 objections made during the trial and the Court -- those 2 rulings of the Court will stand. 3 MR. HAWK: Thank you, Judge. 4 Now, we have prepared various writings. I'11 5 start with the short, fast one. 6 We have submitted a proposed request for a jury instruction that the burden of proof be submitted to 7 8 the jury to be proved beyond all doubt, especially with the 9 presumption -- excuse me -- especially with the Special 10 Issue Number 1. It's also cited in there in our written 11 request. 12 Here's where we've got it. In an indictment 13 in the case, Judge, the indictment makes specific, factual 14 allegations that the defendant did do this, the defendant 15 did do that, the defendant then and there do this. And 16 they're not qualified like the defendant probably caused the 17 death of or the defendant probably engaged in certain 18 conduct. 19 It is a definitive statement that then the 20 State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt. The challenge 21 we face in a capital sentencing scheme is, is that the 22 Special Issue Number 1 is whether there's a probability that 23 the defendant would commit criminal acts of violence. 24 then the State is only required to prove a probability 25 beyond a reasonable doubt, which, in essence, is a

```
8
 1
    qualification on an existing qualification.
 2
                    What we're going to ask the Court to do is
 3
    instruct the jury that they must be absolutely certain,
 4
    prove beyond all doubt, that there's a probability that the
 5
    defendant will commit criminal acts of violence. We have
 6
    given that instruction to the Court in writing, in
 7
    paragraphs -- I guess, cumulative I through VIII.
 8
                               1 through 8 or 1 through 7?
                    THE COURT:
 9
                   MR. HAWK:
                               I said 8; there's only 7; you're
10
    right.
11
                    THE COURT:
                                Okay.
12
                               6 and 7 are the applications.
                   MR. HAWK:
                                                               So
13
    we make that written request prior to the time that the
14
    charge is read to the jury on that one.
15
                    THE COURT: Do you want me to go ahead and
    rule on that one?
16
17
                   MR. HAWK:
                               If you would, Judge.
18
                   THE COURT:
                                That request for the jury
19
    instruction of prove beyond all doubt is denied.
20
                   MR. HAWK:
                               Okay. Second, Judge, we're
21
    requesting a specific instruction to the jury regarding
22
    residual doubt as mitigation. Traditionally, this has been
23
    left for argument to the parties as to whether residual
24
    doubt from the guilt/innocence phase of a trial does rise to
25
    the level of mitigating circumstance.
                                            That's left for the
```

9 1 parties to argue. What we're asking now is beyond that 2 specific instruction as laid out in our request. 3 THE COURT: I've got it. I was reading it. I was reading the proposed requested instruction. 4 5 All right. The requested instruction to the 6 jury regarding residual doubt as mitigation is denied. 7 MR. HAWK: Then, Judge, we have something entitled "Defendant's Objections to the Court's Charge at 8 the Punishment Phase of Trial." These are a series of Roman 9 10 Numeral paragraphs. This I can say is I through VIII. 11 THE COURT: Do you want go on through those? 12 MR. HAWK: Yes, I can go through these 13 briefly, Judge. 14 These we submit to you and ask for rulings by 15 submission. Paragraph I basically deals with the myth of the capital mistrial. The Court never in its charge tells 16 17 the jury that the failure of them to agree unanimously on 18 either special issue results in a life sentence. You just 19 never tell them that in the charge, and we object to it. 20 That's in paragraph I. 21 We're asking for specific relief on that, 22 that they be so informed. As it stands now, they're left 23 with they can't answer that question, but they're never told 24 what will happen if the question is not answered. 25 THE COURT: That's number I?

10 1 MR. HAWK: Well, that's Roman Numeral I in my 2 objections. Failure to inform the consequences of inability 3 to agree. 4 MR. PERKINS: We're looking at a different 5 document, Judge. 6 THE COURT: I'm sorry, Mr. Hawk. That's why 7 I was asking you if that was one. 8 "Defendant's Objections to Court's Charge at 9 Punishment Phase of the Trial," Roman Numeral Number I is 10 failure to inform of consequences of inability to agree. I'm with you now. 11 Go ahead. 12 MR. HAWK: Right. And paragraphs I and II 13 deal with that specific realm of objection that we would 1.4 like to have in the Court's charge, some type of instruction 15 that would clear up this myth for the jury so that the truth 16 be told, they will understand the effect of a nonunanimous 17 verdict. 18 Paragraph III and IV deal with instructions 19 and our objection to any instruction on an issue which is 20 not in the indictment. Obviously, in traditional punishment 21 terms, the juries are required to assess punishment based 22 upon the allegations in the original indictment, but the 23 Texas capital sentencing scheme adds additional issues which 24 are not presented in the indictment, first, on future danger 25 and then on mitigation not originally charged in the

indictment. We object, therefore, to that.

Also, we object to the failure of the Court's charge placed upon the mitigation issue on the State, we believe that, which is where it ought to be in any criminal trial on every material issue.

Paragraph Number VI, we object to the Court's instructions as to the personal, moral culpability of the defendant as a consideration. And there is a good recitation of the concept of what mitigation should be and what it ought to be. And we disagree with the Court's instruction on what that is, although we recognize it's the state of the law.

Paragraph VII, the instruction that either circumstance or circumstances, our opinion is that should simply read "whether there is a sufficient mitigating circumstance." There shouldn't be "or circumstances" in there.

Also, we say that the definition as provided by the Court of mitigation as evidence that a juror might regard as reducing the defendant's moral blameworthiness is unfairly limiting what a juror specifically can consider as mitigation because they may think that there is something which means the defendant should get a life sentence rather than death, but it doesn't necessarily reduce the defendant's moral blameworthiness. We say that's mitigation

12 1 and should be considered under the charge, and we object to 2 that. 3 These are our objections -- I should say 4 global objections in that document. 5 THE COURT: Mr. Bingham? 6 MR. BINGHAM: Judge, we would object to what 7 the defendant to -- to what the defendant has proposed in the record to the Court. 8 9 I'm sorry. I couldn't hear you. THE COURT: 10 MR. BINGHAM: We object. 11 THE COURT: Then in regard to the defendant's 12 objections to Court's charge at punishment phase of trial 13 and the objections contained therein under Roman Numerals 14 I through VIII as set out by Mr. Hawk in his argument to the 15 Court, that is overruled and denied. 16 MR. HAWK: Additionally, to give some kind 17 of -- I haven't said this in a few days -- flavor and 18 context to that specific request to some of the defendant's 19 objections, especially with regard to the myth of the capital mistrial, we are going to request that the Judge 20 21 give the following specific instructions for the following 22 specific verdict form for the jury. 23 "We, the jury, are It reads as follows: 24 unable to answer Special Issue Number 1," and then a line 25 for the Foreman. Or "We, the jury, are unable to answer

13 1 Special Issue Number 2." I should say "and." I want both 2 of those lines on there and both of those sentences on 3 there. 4 We're going to request that to give some kind 5 of vehicle for the jury to currently -- give some kind of 6 context to their inability to decide, which will also help 7 us show another day that there was error in the charge on 8 not giving the instructions on what a nonunanimous verdict 9 means in the first place. 10 THE COURT: Which one is that in, Mr. Hawk? 11 MR. HAWK: That's not in any one. That was 12 just fresh off the thought process, Judge. 13 THE COURT: So you need a ruling on that one? 14 MR. HAWK: Yes, Judge. 15 THE COURT: That's denied. 16 MR. HAWK: Okay. The final document is on 17 the defendant's objections to the Court's charge at 18 punishment. That's the long one; it's got about 54 19 different reasons why we object to it. I will be candid 20 with the Court when I tell you that the state of the law is 21 contrary to these specific objections. I don't want to say 22 they're cumulative, because they're not. They just have 23 specific differences in them, but as a general proposition, 24 these objections have been stated both in our pretrial 25 motions on the constitutionality of the statute, as well as

14 1 the other filed documents, as well as in our request for 2 special voir dire of the jury and things of that nature. 3 I'll see if there's some special ones that I 4 can give some argument for apart from the submission that 5 I've supplied to the Court. 6 THE COURT: Mr. Bingham, have you reviewed 7 the defendant's objections to the charge on punishment, the 8 document Mr. Hawk is going over? 9 I've reviewed it. MR. BINGHAM: THE COURT: 10 I'm going -- just want to make 11 sure you had. That's okay. I'm going to ask you later what 12 your position is. 13 MR. BINGHAM: Yes, sir. 14 THE COURT: I just wanted to make sure you 15 had reviewed it since it has 54 subsections, so to speak. 16 MR. BINGHAM: We received it this morning and 17 had an opportunity to review it. 18 MR. HAWK: Yeah, it now becoming ripe, Judge, 19 we wanted to present this this morning. We would submit this document entitled "Defendant's Objections to the Charge 20 21 at Punishment," and we would offer this for ruling by 22 submission, Judge. There's no additional argument, other 23 than that contained in the instrument. 24 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Hawk. 25 MR. HAWK: There's an order attached to it.

15 1 All we ask is that there be a ruling prior to the time the 2 charge is read to the jury. 3 THE COURT: What's your position, 4 Mr. Bingham, on this Defendant's objections to the Court's 5 charge? Judge, we believe what's 6 MR. BINGHAM: 7 contained in the Defendant's objections to the charge at 8 punishment is not the current status of the law; that to 9 give any of these instructions to the jury at the punishment 10 stage would be contrary to the existing status of the law. 11 We would object to these and ask the Court to deny the 12 defendant's motion or his request in total. THE COURT: 13 All right. Then the Court, 14 having reviewed the defendant's objections to the charge at 15 punishment, being the motion which includes 54 enumerated 16 items, that is overruled and denied. 17 The Court is signing the order provided by 18 Mr. Hawk at this time, overruling and denying the 19 defendant's objections to the charge at punishment, being 20 the objections, the 54 listed in that motion, also the 21 defendant's objections to the Court's charge at the 22 punishment phase of trial, which was the defendant's 23 objections in the written motion. 24 Mr. Hawk, do you just need one order signed, 25 Mr. Hawk? Mr. Hawk, I think I just have one order up here.

16 1 Do you just need one order signed? 2 MR. HAWK: I think I just attached one to 3 that long one. I think you just gave oral rulings on the 4 rest of them. What I'll do, Judge, is I'll provide orders 5 on the rest of them. For some reason, the order didn't make 6 it to you. 7 THE COURT: Well, the Court's rulings have 8 been entered on the record prior to -- obviously, prior to 9 the submission of the charge to the jury. I have signed the 10 one order that was behind the 54-item motion, which was 11 overruled and denied. And the Court has overruled and 12 denied the other motions and requested instructions. If you 13 want me to, I'll sign an order on each of those. 14 MR. HAWK: If there were objections, they 15 were overruled; and if they were a motion, it was denied? 16 THE COURT: Correct. The motions are denied. 17 Any objections are overruled. 18 MR. HAWK: I think that record is clear. 19 If I could be excused for a moment. 20 Court's staff had a question of me. 21 THE COURT: Yes, sir. 22 Still being on the record, obviously, the 23 jury not yet having been in the courtroom, outside the 24 presence of the jury in Cause 241-0978-04, how much time to 25 argue at sentencing does the State request?

```
17
 1
                    MR. BINGHAM:
                                  One hour, Judge.
 2
                    THE COURT: Mr. Perkins, on behalf of the
 3
    defendant?
 4
                    MR. PERKINS:
                                  That should be ample time, Your
 5
    Honor.
 6
                    THE COURT:
                               All right. One hour, then, will
 7
    be allotted by the Court per side.
 8
                    Who will open, Mr. Bingham?
 9
                    MR. BINGHAM: Ms. Sikes will, Judge.
10
                    THE COURT:
                               Do you need a warning,
11
    Mrs. Sikes, in terms of argument?
12
                    MS. SIKES:
                                I probably need several, Judge.
13
    In terms of argument, if I could have a warning after
    30 minutes.
14
1.5
                    THE COURT:
                                All right.
                                             Thank you.
16
                    Do you need a warning, Mr. Perkins?
17
                                  (Shakes head negatively.)
                    MR. PERKINS:
18
                    THE COURT:
                                I didn't think so.
19
                    The Court will keep track of the time, and if
20
    you push up on that hour, the Court will let you know when
    you've got about five minutes to go in case that develops.
21
22
    So you will have some type indication when you're up close.
23
                    MR. PERKINS:
                                  Thank you, Judge.
24
                    THE COURT:
                               Mr. Bingham, I take it you will
25
    be doing the second half?
```

```
18
 1
                                  I'll be doing the closing.
                    MR. BINGHAM:
 2
                    THE COURT: You need some warning up towards
 3
    the end of your 30?
 4
                    MR. BINGHAM: When I have five minutes
 5
    remaining, Judge, if I get that far.
 6
                    THE COURT:
                               Are we ready for the jury?
 7
    Anything further before we bring the jury in?
 8
                    THE BAILIFF:
                                  All rise for the jury.
 9
                    (The jury enters the courtroom.)
10
                    (Open court, defendant and jury present.)
1.1
                    THE COURT: Be seated, please.
                                                     Thank you.
12
                    Mr. Perkins, the State having rested, what
13
    says the Defense?
14
                    MR. PERKINS:
                                  Your Honor, Ladies and
15
    Gentlemen of the Jury, the Defense rests as well.
16
                    THE COURT:
                                Thank you, Mr. Perkins.
17
                    MR. BINGHAM: Your Honor, the State would
18
    close.
19
                                  And the Defense closes as well.
                    MR. PERKINS:
20
                    THE COURT:
                                Thank you, Mr. Perkins.
21
                    Ladies and Gentlemen, all of the evidence in
22
    this case at the sentencing phase is now concluded.
23
    sides having rested and closed, the Court is going to now
24
    read to you the charge of the Court, which has all of the
25
    law contained in it that will govern and guide you and that
```

you will follow and the law that you will apply in deciding the issues at the sentencing phase of this trial.

Once the Court finishes reading the charge of the Court to you, which contains all the law that you will need and all the instructions you will need, each side in the case, as you saw before, will have an opportunity to argue the sentencing phase of the trial.

The State will proceed first. Ms. Sikes will give the opening argument on behalf of the State, Mr.

Perkins will give the argument on behalf of the defendant, and then Mr. Bingham will give the closing argument on behalf of the State.

At the end of the arguments, the case will be submitted to you. As you already know, the Court's charge will be taken into the jury room by you. In the event there is any evidence during your deliberations that you need that was introduced anywhere in the trial, then you would be able to simply communicate that to Carleton, and he would communicate it to me, and the Court will have it sent to you.

So at this time, the Court will read the charge of the Court to you.

"Cause Number 241-0978-04, the State of Texas versus Tracy Beatty: Ladies and Gentlemen of the Jury, by your verdict returned in this case, you have found the

defendant, Tracy Beatty, guilty of the offense of capital murder, which was alleged to have been committed on or about the 25th day of November, 2003, in Smith County, Texas.

"It is necessary now for you to determine from all of the evidence in the case the answers to certain questions called special issues in this charge. The Court instructs you further, however, as follows: The mandatory punishment for capital murder is death or confinement in the Institutional Division of the Texas Department Of Criminal Justice for life.

"In deliberating on Special Issue Number 1 and Special Issue Number 2, submitted in this charge, the jury shall consider all evidence admitted at the guilt or innocence stage and the punishment stage of this trial, including evidence of the defendant's background or character or the circumstances of the offense that militates for or mitigates against the imposition of the death penalty.

"The burden of proof in answering Special Issue Number 1 still rests upon the State and never shifts to the defendant. Special Issue Number 1 must be proven by the State beyond a reasonable doubt. Therefore, before Special Issue Number 1 may be answered yes, all jurors must be convinced by the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that the answer to such special issue should be yes.

"If the jury unanimously determines and only if such determination is unanimous that the State has proved Special Issue Number 1 beyond a reasonable doubt, that is, the State has proved beyond a reasonable doubt that there is a probability that the defendant, Tracy Beatty, would commit criminal acts of violence that would constitute a continuing threat to society, then the jury foreman will so record the jury's answer of yes to Special Issue Number 1 by signing his or her name to the finding reflecting such answer on the form provided for that purpose.

"You are further instructed that if any juror, after considering the evidence and these instructions, has a reasonable doubt as to whether the answer to Special Issue Number 1 should be answered yes, then such juror should vote no to Special Issue Number 1 in the jury's deliberations.

"If 10 jurors or more vote no to Special Issue Number 1, then the answer of the jury shall be no to that issue, and the jury foreman will so record the jury's answer of no by signing his or her name to the finding reflecting such answer on the form for that purpose.

"If in answering Special Issue Number 1, the vote of the jurors is not unanimously yes or not at least 10 in favor of an answer of no, then there shall be no answer for that special issue, and the jury foreman shall not sign

his or her name to that answer form for that Special Issue Number 1.

"Members of the jury need not agree on what particular evidence supports a negative answer to Special Issue Number 1. The burden of proof in answering Special Issue Number 1 rests upon the State throughout the trial and never shifts to the defendant.

"The fact that a person has been arrested, confined, or indicted for or otherwise charged with the offense gives rise to no inference at his trial. With respect to any and all issues in this trial, the law does not require a defendant to produce any evidence at all, and the defendant has no burden of proof as to any issue in the trial of this case.

"It is not required that the prosecution prove an affirmative answer to Special Issue Number 1 beyond all possible doubt. It is required that the prosecution's proof excludes all reasonable doubt concerning an affirmative answer to Special Issue Number 1.

"You are further instructed that if the jury unanimously returns an affirmative finding to both Special Issue Number 1, the jury shall answer Special Issue Number 2. If, however, the jury returns a negative answer to Special Issue Number 1 or if the jury has not answered Special Issue Number 1, then under the Court's instructions

23 in this charge, do not answer Special Issue Number 2. 1 2 "If the jury has answered Special Issue 3 Number 1 yes, then the jury shall answer Special Issue 4 Number 2 either yes or no. Before Special Issue Number 2 5 may be answered no, all jurors must be convinced that the 6 answer to such issue should be no. 7 "If the jury unanimously determines and only 8 if such determination is unanimous that the answer to 9 Special Issue Number 2 is no, then the jury foreman will so 10 record the jury foreman's answer to Special Issue Number 2 11 by signing his or her name to the finding reflecting such 12 answer on the form provided for that purpose. 13 "If 10 jurors or more vote yes to Special 14 Issue Number 2, then the answer of the jury shall be yes to 15 that issue, and the jury foreman will so record the jury's 16 answer by signing his or her name to the finding reflecting 17 such answer on the form for that purpose. 18 "If in answering Special Issue Number 2, the vote of the jurors is not unanimously no or not at least 10 19 20 in favor of an answer of yes, then there shall be no answer 21 for that special issue, and the jury foreman should not sign 22 his or her name to any answer form for that Special Issue Number 2. 23 24 "Members of the jury need not agree on what

particular evidence supports an affirmative answer to

25

e

Special Issue Number 2. In deliberating on Special Issue
Number 2 submitted in this charge, the jury shall consider
all evidence admitted at the guilt or innocence stage and
the punishment stage of this trial, taking into
consideration all of the evidence, including the
circumstances of the offense, the defendant's character and
background and the personal moral culpability of the
defendant in determining whether or not there is sufficient
mitigating circumstance or circumstances to warrant that a
sentence of life imprisonment rather than a death sentence
be imposed.

"Further, the jury is instructed to consider mitigating evidence to be evidence that a juror might regard as reducing the defendant's moral blameworthiness.

"You are instructed that under the law applicable in this case, if the jury answers that a circumstance or circumstances warranted a sentence of life imprisonment rather than a death sentence be imposed, the Court will sentence the defendant to imprisonment in the Institutional Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice for life.

"Under the law applicable in this case, if the defendant is sentenced to imprisonment in the Institutional Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice for life, the defendant will become eligible for

release on parole but not until the actual time served by the defendant equals 40 years without consideration of any good conduct time.

"It cannot accurately be predicted how the parole laws might be applied to this defendant if the defendant is sentenced to a term of imprisonment for life because the application of those laws will depend on decisions made by prison and parole authorities. But eligibility for parole does not guarantee that parole will be granted.

"Our law provides that a defendant may testify in his own behalf if he elects to do so. This, however, is a privilege accorded to a defendant and in the event he elects not to testify, that fact cannot be taken as a circumstance against him.

"In this case, the defendant has elected not to testify, and you are instructed that you cannot and must not refer or allude to that fact throughout your deliberations or take it into consideration for any purpose whatsoever as a circumstance against the defendant nor will you refer to or discuss any matter not before you in evidence.

"At times throughout the trial, the Court has been called upon to pass on the question of whether or not certain offered evidence might properly be admitted. You

are not to be concerned with the reasons for such rulings and are not to draw any inferences from them.

"Whether offered evidence is admissible is purely a question of law. In admitting evidence to which an objection is made, the Court does not determine what weight should be given such evidence nor does it pass on the credibility of the witnesses.

"As to the offer of evidence that has been rejected by the Court, you, of course, must not consider the same. As to any question to which an objection was sustained, you must not conjecture as to what the answer might have been or as to the reason for the objection.

"Specifically, the Court has sustained objections and given you explicit instructions to disregard irrelevant, improper, and inadmissible questions, answers, and evidence in this trial.

"You are reminded of the instruction of the Court given you in this trial, and you are instructed to carefully follow those instructions in your deliberations. You are to deliberate only on evidence that is properly before you in this trial and to give this case individual deliberation based only on the evidence admitted before you in this trial.

"You are instructed that you are not to allow yourselves to be influenced to any degree whatsoever by what

you may think or surmise the opinion of the Court to be.

The Court has no right, by any word or any act, to indicate any opinion respecting any matter of fact involved in this case nor to indicate any desire respecting its outcome.

"The Court has not intended to express any opinion upon any matter of fact in this case, and if you have observed anything which you have or may interpret as the Court's opinion upon any matter of fact in the case, you must wholly disregard it.

"You are further instructed that any statements of counsel made during the course of the trial or during argument not supported by the evidence or statements of law made by counsel not in harmony with the law, as stated to you by the Court in these instructions, are to be wholly disregarded.

"You are charged that it is only from the witness stand that the jury is permitted to receive evidence regarding this case, and no juror is permitted to communicate with any other juror anything he or she may have heard regarding the case from any source other than the witness stand.

"It is not permissible of you under any circumstances in answering the special issues to decide this same by lot or by straws or by any method of chance.

Deciding a case by lot or by any method of chance is not

permissible, and you are instructed in this case that you must not consider any proposition of this character, but the answers to the special issues must be determined and agreed upon by each juror by the facts of the case as testified to by the witnesses and the law as given you in the charge of the Court.

"You are the exclusive judges of the facts proved -- of the facts provided, of the credibility of the witnesses, and the weight to be given to the testimony, but you are bound to receive the law from the Court, which is herein given you, and be governed thereby.

"After you have retired to consider your verdict, no one has any authority to communicate with you except the officer or bailiff who has you in charge. You may communicate with this Court in writing, signed by your presiding juror, through the officer or bailiff who has you in charge. Do not attempt to talk to the officer, the attorneys, or the Court concerning any question you may have.

"After you have arrived at your verdict, you may use the appropriate verdict form or forms attached hereto by having your presiding juror sign the particular form or forms which conforms to your verdict." That's signed by Jack Skeen, Jr., Presiding Judge of the 241st District Court.

29 1 The special issues with forms for your answer 2 or answers are as follows: 3 "Special Issue Number 1: Is there a 4 probability that the defendant, Tracy Beatty, would commit criminal acts of violence that would constitute a continuing 5 6 threat to society? 7 "Answer to Special Issue Number 1: We, the 8 jury, unanimously find and determine beyond a reasonable 9 doubt that the answer to this Special Issue Number 1 is yes" 10 with a place for the Foreman to sign; 11 Or "We, the jury, because at least 10 jurors 12 do not find or have a reasonable doubt as to the matter 13 inquired about in this Special Issue Number 1, find and 14 determine that the answer to this Special Issue Number 1 is 15 no" with a line for the Foreman to sign. 16 "If you have unanimously answered Special 17 Issue Number 1 yes, then answer Special Issue Number 2. 18 Otherwise, do not answer Special Issue Number 2. 19 "Special Issue Number 2: Taking into 20 consideration all of the evidence, including the 21 circumstances of the offense, the defendant's character and 22 background, and the personal moral culpability of the 23 defendant, is there sufficient circumstance or circumstances 24 to warrant that a sentence of life imprisonment rather than 25 a death sentence be imposed?

30 1 "Answer to Special Issue Number 2: We, the 2 jury, unanimously find and determine the answer to this 3 Special Issue Number 2 is no" with a line for the Foreman to 4 sign; 5 Or "We, the jury, because at least 10 jurors 6 do find the answer to Special Issue Number 2 is yes, do 7 hereby find and answer -- do hereby find and determine that 8 the answer to this Special Issue Number 2 is yes" with a 9 place for the Foreman to sign. 10 The jury certificate. "We, the jury, return 11 in open court the above answer or answers as our answer or 12 answers to the special issue or special issues submitted to 13 us, and the same is our verdict in this case" with a place 14 for the Foreman to sign. 15 Counsel, will you approach the bench just a 16 second? 17 (At the bench, on the record.) 18 THE COURT: Under 4 at the bottom of this 19 page down here, if you read down here, "You are further instructed if the jury unanimously returns an affirmative 20 21 finding to both Special Issue Number 1," I don't believe that word --22 23 MR. HAWK: It should not be there. 24 THE COURT: I caught that when I was reading 25 it through with the jury.

	P
	31
1	Are you in agreement?
2	MR. PERKINS: Yes, Your Honor.
3	THE COURT: Are both the State and Defense
4	would both the State and Defense be in agreement for the
5	Court to mark the word "both" out and initial it?
. 6	MR. HAWK: I think that's fine, Judge.
7	MR. BINGHAM: I agree.
8	(End of bench conference.)
9	THE COURT: The Court will now recognize
10	Ms. Sikes for opening argument on behalf of the State.
11	Do you need the podium?
12	MS. SIKES: Please, sir.
13	THE COURT: Carleton, would you get the
14	podium, please, sir?
15	THE BAILIFF: (Complies.)
16	THE COURT: Ms. Sikes.
17	MS. SIKES: May it please the Court.
18	THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.
19	MS. SIKES: Counsel.
20	I want to start by saying that I feel an
21	unbelievably large responsibility as I stand before you, a
22	responsibility to the victim of this horrendous crime.
23	May I approach the board, Judge?
24	THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.
25	MS. SIKES: We lose sight sometimes of the

1.4

fact that this is why we're here, a woman named Carolyn Callie Meme Click. I feel a responsibility to Ms. Click, and I feel a responsibility to her friends and to her family that are sitting out there in that courtroom.

I think the best I can hope for is to somehow, for at least the next 30 minutes or so that I'm with you, try to do justice to her memory. I'll tell you, I've thought a long time about what I'd say to you if given the opportunity to argue the punishment phase of this case, and I'm going to start by addressing the opening statement made by Mr. Perkins.

Do you remember that? It went something like this: "Now you'll know why the State was so mad at Tracy Beatty, mad enough to turn a murder into a capital murder."

Do you remember that opening statement?

Let me tell you this: I want to say two things about that. I think it's a great place to start my arguments for these reasons: First of all, it wrongfully shifts the blame, right? I'm going to tell you this: The State of Texas didn't do anything to change a murder into a capital murder. We didn't do that. The jury didn't do that.

I want -- I want to make that so clear to you, that you took an oath, right? You followed the law and the evidence. You returned the right verdict. If there's

anybody in this entire courtroom that took a murder and made it a capital, can I give you one guess who it is?

There he sits. Tracy Beatty. See him sitting there? He turned a murder into a capital murder by what you've already found him guilty of doing to that precious woman. And don't you let anybody tell you otherwise. You hold your heads up high. You made the right decision. You based it on the evidence.

Now let's talk about that second part of that opening. It went something like this: "The State of Texas is mad at Tracy Beatty." Let me tell you this: Do you think the State of Texas has a right to be mad at Tracy Beatty? Let me tell you something. I'm not speaking for all the State of Texas, but I'm speaking for this part of it: Me, April Allison Sikes, the chief felony prosecutor for that elected district attorney.

And let me tell you something. If you don't know now when I start that I'm mad, I bet you know it by the time I finish. And do I have a right to be mad? Yes. Do you? Yes. This is your community. He's out there in it killing people.

Do you have a right to be mad? Yes. Do you have to apologize for it? Never. And neither do I and neither does the District Attorney's Office at all. I'm mad as a prosecutor, I'm mad as a member of this community, and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

34 I'm real mad as a mother. Y'all have kids. You have a son. You're expecting a child. Does it make you mad? It ought to. I'm not going to spend any time on the charge. We talked about that in voir dire. You remember I told you you would get the law from the Judge. He just read Just take it back there just like you did on the other part of the trial. You know the two questions. The first one -y'all can probably tell them to me. You know the first one. Is there a probability that the defendant is going to continue to commit criminal acts of violence that would constitute a continuing threat to society, right? You know the second one. Mitigation. It says, taking into consideration all the evidence, the circumstances of the offense, the defendant's character and background, the personal moral culpability of the defendant, is there sufficient mitigating circumstance, one or more, to warrant a sentence of life rather than death. We're going to start with that first one. Future danger is what we've called it all along. remember in voir dire when I told you there wasn't going to be any magic screen that came down; Judge Skeen wasn't going

to say, "Okay. Well, the first part of the trial is over,

right, so let's block that off; don't think about that;

let's just move forward"? It didn't happen, did it? He didn't instruct you on that. Did you hear what he said in the charge? You can consider all of what you've heard.

And that's where we're going to start. When you go back there in the jury room, I want you to remember the story of Carolyn Callie Meme Click. You don't have to forget that. I bet you don't. I bet you won't for a very long time. And I could drag pictures up here. There's a stack of them right there. But you know what? I think she's been disrespected long enough. I really do.

But don't forget that story. And the story goes something like this: It's a story of a mother who loved her son regardless of his criminal history.

You remember Tamara Beatty? She's sitting right out there on that second row. What did she tell you? She said, "Meme didn't like him, but she loved him," right? He sent her to the hospital before. You remember Lieanna Wilkerson? He left her for dead. That's hard to understand unless you're a parent.

And then, you know, she opened up her home and her heart and said, "I want us to be at peace." And it cost her. There is no greater love than that of a parent and a child. I know. I'm both a child and a parent, and so are y'all. So Carolyn Click is excited. Her son is coming home.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the wall.

36 I could tell you the rest of that story. You know how it starts out. The first week he's there, she's excited to take him to Lieanna Wilkerson. She's cooking dinner. They drive up. Callie is in tears because he doesn't understand why they've got to drive, berating her Remember? First week home. Callie is in tears. already. Do you think she's starting to get disappointed? Fast-forward to that last day when she talked to Betty McCarty out there in tears and said what? "I finally told him to go." Do you think she was sad it didn't work out? Do you think she was disappointed? Do you think she was at the end of her rope? Do you think she felt helpless? you think she felt scared? Do you think she had a reason to It looks like she did, didn't she? She didn't know that minutes later, she's breathing her last breath. Don't go back into that jury room and forget that he broke her ribs. How many times do you think he hit her? Do you think if you hit somebody one time, your second, third, and fifth ribs are broken? How many times do you think it took? How about her head? Both sides. think he slammed it into something? Probably. He's done it before. Remember that? Taking her and hitting her head in

Don't forget that.

Don't forget that he choked her and strangled her and broke her bones and tied pantyhose around her neck in a knot. What do you think was going through her mind when he had his hands around her neck? What do you think she thought? Why? Do you think she thought, "What have I done to deserve this? I love you. How can you do this to me?"

Do you think she prayed? And do you think it mattered? Not to that monster. What did he do? You saw me grab Mr. Bingham's neck. Do you think he broke any bones? You go back there, and you think about the force it took to crush her voicebox, to take from her the very life of the person that gave life to him. How dare he? Who does he think he is?

Let me ask you this: What kind of monster does it take to commit that kind of crime? Have you looked pure evil in the face? There he sits. Take a good long look because that's it in its purest form.

And if that's not enough, he takes her clothes off. And I'll tell you I can't hardly get past that, that 42-year-old man taking off the bra and the panties of his mother. Does that anger you? I'm going to tell you, it infuriates me. Am I mad at Tracy Beatty? You bet I am.

And if that's not enough, then he goes out

38 and he digs a hole, and he dumps her in it like she's some 1 2 kind of discarded trash. You think that's the kind of 3 person that Dr. McNeel and Dr. Gripon were describing to you 4 yesterday? Yes. Callous, unfeeling, no social conscience. 5 Do you think they were right? Yes. And every single thing 6 you've heard in this courtroom tells you they're right, both 7 of them. 8 And if that's not bad enough, what does he do 9 after that? He dumps her nude body in that hole and does exactly what? He spends her money, takes her car, continues 10 11 to degrade her, spends her hard-earned money on dope to 12 shoot into his sorry body. 13 And probably the worst thing that I just 14 really can't hardly get over is that he touched her things. 15 You know, they may be trash to a lot of people, but let me tell you something. They meant something to her. 16 I've spent a lot of time thinking about those 17 18 things. I can't hardly get past it. I think about her jewelry, and I wonder, did somebody special give that to 19 20 her? Did Tamara play with it when she was playing dress-up 21 at her grandma's house, at Meme's? And I think, how dare he 22 touch her things? He had no right. 23 This capital murder case is the ultimate 24 betrayal. He betrayed the mother who loved him.

Meme took those

Tamara Beatty told you that.

25

know she did.

39 1 kids to see him. Where? The penitentiary, where he spent 2 his whole life. She loved him, and it cost her her life. 3 And I beg you not to forget that. 4 The facts of this case show you that Tracy 5 Beatty is a future danger. They answer Special Issue 6 And if that's not enough, you got to hear about a Number 1. 7 little baby named Ashley Coomer. You remember her? 8 months old, 19 months old. Do you think that crime is 9 important in determining future danger? 10 Think about this. You think about what kind 11 of person it takes to take an extension cord and expose a 12 wire and touch the head of a child, one and a half, for the 13 pure pleasure of it. Did he do it to watch her cry? 14 touch it on her tummy? You heard her mommy say it looked 15 like a welding torch had touched her tummy. Did he do it to 16 watch her skin burn, to smell what it was like? 17 What was going through her mind? How about, 18 "Why is he hurting me? What did I do wrong? Where's my 19 mommy?" And the baby hides in the closet, too young to help 20 herself. Just old enough to hide. 21 Another victim left in the wake of the evil 22 that is Tracy Beatty, a baby who lost the sparkle in her 23 eyes. Her mom told you she wasn't the same. And what was 24 her crime? Did she cry? Did she want to play? Was she 25 hungry? Was she thirsty?

Does that show you Tracy Beatty's a future danger? You bet he is. The evidence shows you what Tracy Beatty does to people. And I could go through a long list of victims he left in his wake.

Let me group it like this: He curses them. He humiliates them. He discriminates against them based on the color of their skin. He spits in their face. He shocks them. He stabs them. He burns them. He bites them. He breaks their bones. And finally he kills them. Does that about cover it?

That's why I say take a good long look.

There evil sits. It doesn't matter what a person's age is either, does it? He's got victims from 18 to 19 months old to 62 years old, family members to strangers. And his victims have endured everything from humiliation to capital murder.

You know what I can't get out of my mind is that letter he wrote to Tamara Beatty -- there she sits -- saying, "You know what? You're worthless" because she's a middle-aged kid that happens to be dating a person whose skin is a different color.

So what? What was her crime? Trying to have a relationship with a sorry dog who's been in the pen his whole life. That was her crime. You're not worthless. Let me tell you something, Tamara Beatty. There's one worthless

person in this courtroom, and it's not you. Another victim left in the wake of Tracy Beatty.

And his victims have been guards, and his victims have been inmates, and his victims have lived, and his victims have died. Let me tell you this: You remember we talked a lot about what the definition of society is? I don't think it matters.

Let me tell you something. If your definition is kids, he's hurt them; if your definition is adults, he's hurt them; family members, he's hurt them; strangers, he's hurt them; guards; inmates. You name it, he's done it.

And it doesn't take much to become one of his victims. You can be a guard and say, "You know, you're really supposed to get your hair cut." Kapow, your bones are broken like that.

Let's talk for a second about how he spent his life. I'm not going to read all of this. Here's the drug use: 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 23, 22, on into the pen, alcohol, marijuana, hasheesh, mushrooms, cocaine, meth, speed, LSD, buying and selling, more victims. If you're a person who has a drug problem, why don't you just go and sell it to a bunch of other people? Create a bunch more problems in their lives.

Here's his criminal history that I could fit

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

42 on one board. Look at it. Thefts, escape, DWIs, injury to a child, probation revoked, and he hadn't been out since, not for more than nine months. There it is. Here's other arrests he's admitted to. You name them. Evading arrest, criminal trespass, theft by check, possession of marijuana, carrying weapons, DWIs. You name it, he's done it. You know what that tells you? That tells you that there is nothing in this system that hadn't been tried at which he hadn't failed. Four parole attempts; four failures; the last one being just about the worst one of all, wouldn't you agree? He couldn't make it 60 days without killing his mother and throwing her in a hole. Tracy Beatty does what Tracy Beatty wants to do, period. He is a selfish career criminal who hurts who he wants to hurt when he wants to hurt them and in the way he chooses to do it. You remember what Dr. McNeel said? Ιf anything inconveniences him, you're in trouble. Impulse control: None. Selfish. Sociopathic personality. You think those things are important in determining future danger? Sure they are. How about the escalation of his violence? How about the fact that he can't make parole? How about the fact that you've got to be 100 percent evil to electrocute a child for the fun of it

and to murder your own mother? You think about a person

like that, and then you ask yourself, is he going to care about future crimes? Is he going to stop and think twice? Are you kidding me?

Do you think he's going to go down to the penitentiary and go, "Oh, well, I probably ought to not hit that guard in the face." Gosh, he's so far past that, that's laughable. That's ridiculous, and it's also pathetic. He doesn't care. What makes you think he's going to start caring now? He never has, and he never will.

They also told you he's not choosy about where he commits his crimes. In the free world, we know about weapons and drugs and alcohol and felony thefts and the 18-month-old baby. He stabbed a 22-year-old man. He assaulted his mother, sent her to the hospital, and then committed the ultimate crime of capital murder. That's while out here with me and you in the few months he's actually been out.

While incarcerated, he's escaped; he's fought with inmates; he's spit on officers; he's cursed officers; he's threatened to kill officers and their families; he's committed the felony of aggravated assault on an officer; he's possessed contraband. And while awaiting trial for capital murder, he's so concerned, he's doing what in our jail, in your jail? Making shanks. You think he was gonna use it? He has before. It wouldn't be the first person he

44 1 stabbed. 2 You remember Dr. Gripon told you this phrase: 3 "Past conduct is the best predictor for future conduct. 4 That's why we spent so much time on his past record. It's 5 pretty hard to think of a crime he hadn't committed. 6 How about the evidence that you heard from 7 the guards and from Mr. Smithey and Mr. Rogers when they 8 told you -- every one of them said the same thing -- there 9 is no place within the system where you can place a 10 defendant and keep other inmates and guards safe. You remember that? 11 12 Fights, inmates on inmates, inmates on 13 guards, weapons made, and weapons used, gangs and crimes and 14 violence. And do you think that Tracy Beatty, who has 15 assaulted or threatened officers 16 times already -- that 16 was before he killed his mother, before he made this 17 weapon -- do you think he would go to jail and be a future 18 danger? 19 Have we proven that to you beyond a 20 reasonable doubt? Probably. Probably will. More than 21 probably. That's what the evidence shows you. 22 I'm going to ask you this: Everything we've 23 talked about so far, that's before the doctors came on. Ιf 24 I had asked you prior to Dr. Gripon and Dr. McNeel 25 testifying, do you think he's going to be a future danger,

would you have an answer? But, you know, they came on anyway, and they testified. And did it make you feel better that they confirmed what you already knew?

They told you they had indicators, things that were important to them, things that told them he was going to be a future danger. Criminal history beginning at an early age, variety of crimes committed, escalation of violence, many types of victims, chronic drug and alcohol abuse, he had sociopathic, antisocial disorder, lack of impulse control, explosive temper, history of violence while incarcerated, he made and possessed deadly weapons, and it was hands-up and up-close personal violence.

They used those things. Are those things important to you? You bet they are. And what did they conclude? No indication that the criminal acts of violence will stop. None. High probability of future danger. That's what the doctors said. Did they confirm what you already knew? They're right, and so are you. And the answer to Special Issue Number 1 is yes.

And then you move on to Special Issue Number 2, the mitigation section. And I'll tell you this:
Mitigation is something that lessens the moral blameworthiness of the defendant. And I'm not going to spend very much time on it. Can you guess why? There is no mitigation. There's none. There's not one single, solitary

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

46 circumstance that justifies a life sentence over a death sentence. Not one. What could it be? What have you heard? Well, you heard he came from a single-parent home. He had a hip replacement. He's got skin disease. He has one kidney. He drinks and uses drugs. But you know already that's no defense. Let me tell you, you've already heard it once today, but I've got a real complicated legal argument for those things, things like, "I came from a single-family (sic) home." You know what it goes like? Listen. So what? Do you think there's not people in this very courtroom who came from single-parent homes? The doctor wants to replace my knee. I can assure you I'm not going to go kill my mother. replacement, skin disease, single-parent home. Are vou

kidding me? Do you think those things give him the right to go and take the life of his mother in cold blood? didn't. It's ridiculous.

You've heard no mitigation that rises to that level we talked about to justify life over death. The evidence has shown you -- it's told you, not me -- the evidence you heard in this courtroom tells you the answers to the special issues. And you know what they are.

The first one is yes; Tracy Beatty is a

future danger. And the second one is no; there is no mitigation to justify a life sentence rather than death sentence.

I told you in voir dire that you would know by the answers to your questions the resulting punishment. You remember that? And you do. And you know that when you answer yes and no, that Judge Skeen is going to impose the death penalty.

There will be no life sentence. There will be no 40 more years of a prison system trying to protect other people from Tracy Beatty. That cannot be done, and you know that. You can't send him back to general population and let him earn his way back into ad. seg. You know about earning your way back in. You know how you do that? Commit future acts of violence.

Don't give him another victim. The penitentiary couldn't control him before November 25th, 2003, when Ms. Click lost her life. They can't control him now. He's over there making knives. And they can't control him in the future. They just can't. And the evidence that you heard does not require them to do it. We've reached the end. We have finally reached the end.

Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a death penalty case. There's just simply nothing left to do. There can be no more crimes. There can be no more victims. It ends with

48 1 You have the power with your verdict, and it's time 2 for you to let the evidence lead you to justice. It's time. 3 I plead with you to remember the acts of 4 Tracy Beatty, his life of violence, and I plead with you to 5 listen for the voices of his victims, those of the past and 6 those that would be in the future. 7 When you answer those questions according to 8 the evidence, the death penalty is going to be imposed, but 9 it will be imposed based on the actions of that man, Tracy 10 Beatty. Don't let anybody guilt you about this verdict, just like we talked about when we started. You see, we've 11 12 come full circle. 13 He did it. He spent his life earning this 14 He knows what your verdict is going to be. sentence. 15 chose that punishment. He chose it when he chose to commit 16 these crimes his whole life, ending with the one with his 17 hands around the neck of his mother. 18 So go back in that jury room and answer those 19 questions based upon the evidence you heard, and when you 20 do, the death sentence is going to be imposed. And at long last, at very long last, justice is going to finally be 21 22 served. 23 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Sikes. 24 Mr. Perkins. 25 MR. PERKINS: Thank you, Judge.

	49
1	A JUROR: Judge?
2	THE COURT: Yes.
3	A JUROR: I need a break.
4	THE COURT: We will take a 15-minute recess.
5	All rise for the jury.
6	(The jury leaves the courtroom.)
7	(Recess.)
8	(Open court, defendant present, no jury.)
9	THE COURT: Back on the record in Cause
10	Number 241-0978-04, the State versus Tracy Beatty. State's
11	counsel is present; the defense counsel is present; and the
12	defendant is present.
13	Bring in the jury, Carleton.
14	(The jury enters the courtroom.)
15	(Open court, defendant and jury present.)
16	THE COURT: Be seated, please. Thank you.
17	The Court will recognize Mr. Perkins.
18	MR. PERKINS: May it please the Court.
19	THE COURT: Yes, sir.
20	MR. PERKINS: Counsel for the State.
21	Good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen.
22	I want to talk to you about a couple of
23	things, but the very first thing I want to do is to tell you
24	how much I appreciate people like April Sikes. She is a
25	tremendous advocate for her side. She and there's

50 1 nothing wrong with this -- had lots of y'all in tears and 2 rightfully so, because what Tracy Beatty did is 3 indefensible. There's no excuse. 4 I told you that in the first stage of the 5 trial. There's no excuse for killing your unarmed, 6 62-year-old mother. That's it. Just as plain and as simple 7 as I can say it. He's brutal; he's vicious; he's violent; 8 he's a criminal; he's a dope user; he's a thief; he's a -- I 9 mean, how many bad things do I have to say, does the State 10 have to say, for you to believe it? 11 Now, I'm going to draw the line at something, 12 and I'm going to say something that may be offensive to you, 13 hard to understand, offensive to the State, hard for me to 14 understand. Tracy Beatty is not 100 percent evil. 15 Beatty is not worthless. Tracy Beatty is a child of God. 16 Believe it, not believe it. Understand it, not understand 17 it. 18 What we have to defend against at this stage 19 of the trial is the same thing that I've been defending 20 against all along. Now, I bet some lights have come on for 21 some of you as to why we were giving examples about "I'm the 22 worst person in the world. I'm the worst scumbag that there 23 ever was." You know what? He's not 100 percent worthless. 24 And it's very subtle thing. And Ms. Sikes is very good at 25 what she does.

51 1 It's easier to kill somebody if you 2 dehumanize them first; make them 100 percent evil; make them 3 a monster; make them worthless. And you know what? 4 easy to do when you have these kind of facts, right? 5 All you've got to do is just cross that last 6 bridge and say there's nothing about him worth saving. 7 worthless, 100 percent evil. He's all these things that the 8 State says. 9 I want to talk to you a minute about the 10 cons -- well, I probably should sit down and let Ken talk 11 about this, because he's a lot better than I am -- the 12 concept of respect, respect for other people's opinions, 13 respect for the law, respect for life. Tracy Beatty doesn't 14 respect any of those. 15 Does that mean you shouldn't? Does that mean 16 I shouldn't? Does that mean that once the State convicts 17 him, you know, through their evidence and your verdict? And 18 let me tell you something. I respect your verdict. 19 hard to be on a jury. And I disagree with it. 20 You know what? This is America. I still 21 have the right to disagree with your verdict, but I respect 22 I know y'all didn't go back there and five minutes later come back with a verdict. I respect your hard work. 23 24 I admire it. 25 I tell you, that it's -- well, I can't tell

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

52 you what I want to say about what it is to be on a jury, but it's not good. I respect it. I just respectfully disagree with it. And do you think I'm going down easy? Do you think I'm going down without a fight? You don't know me. You don't know that I'm going to stand up for the worst scumbag that you've ever seen, but I am, because he's not He's not 100 percent evil. You can look him in worthless. the eyes all you want to, and you're not going to see the devil sitting over there no matter how hard you squint. You're going to see a child of God sitting over at that table and a child of God who has made terrible, horrible criminal decisions his whole miserable life. How's that? You know, I'm going to echo something that Ms. Sikes said. Ms. Sikes said that she felt tremendous responsibility. Oh, yeah? Switch sides of the table and see how you feel. She thinks it's scary on her side of the table. Let's switch sides for a while. I'll take this This is the easy side. I've been over here. side. I feel such tremendous responsibility, because I am charged with watching out for the legal rights of somebody who the State is trying to get y'all to execute. And she feels responsibility? And I'll tell you how far

that responsibility goes with me.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

old Robert missed.

53 I look back -- here's the transcript of the trial right here (indicating), and when we get through during the day, I get to go home and read that stuff. you know what? I am an idiot. Here I am. I'm an idiot. You know why? I guess my parents were I'll blame it on them. idiots. I don't know why I'm an Why did I miss something so obvious? Why did I miss something so important that if I had caught it and pointed it out to you, we might not even be here. It might be a situation where we had eliminated the death penalty entirely as a possibility. And you know what? I talked at closing argument in the guilt or innocence phase about Ken's bad choice of words, nobility instead of macho thing. the worse thing that Ken Hawk ever does, Ken Hawk will be a I am an idiot. genius. Because you know what I missed? that's not only mitigating but might have been exculpatory. You are entitled to consider all of the evidence. right there in the Court's charge that you're going to get to take back there with you, all the evidence from the guilt or innocence phase. And if you consider lingering, residual doubt as mitigating, you're entitled to consider that.

Let me talk to you about something that dumb,

You remember Mr. Bingham's argument at

the first stage of the trial he argued. One of the arguments was that Tracy Beatty was guilty because he stole Carolyn Click's car and he's over in Malakoff about an hour, hour and a half after she disappears. Y'all remember that, I'm sure.

I'm an idiot. I knew that that couldn't be right. And if you'll recall the evidence in the case, I pointed out to you that there were receipts showing that the car wasn't -- well, that the car was gassed up in Malakoff on the 29th and not on the 25th.

And I knew that Stacey Killough had to be wrong about her dates and him showing up that soon afterwards and having exercise and control over property.

And I know that y'all found him guilty of burglary of a habitation -- or while in the course of committing burglary of a habitation.

And so I'm thinking like, you know, their argument that he stole the car and went over there and that he was there an hour to an hour and a half later, I can understand why you would do it. Again, I respectfully disagree with that verdict, but I understand.

But I am such an idiot. I went back and read the transcript to try to figure out, based on the notes sent out about where he was and all of that stuff. I reread it, reread it, reread everybody's. I knew Stacey Killough had

```
55
 1
    to be wrong, and that's why we brought up those gas card
 2
    receipts and everything else.
 3
                    August the 3rd, 2004, April Sikes asks
 4
    Lieanna Wilkerson, "Did you see Tracy Beatty on November the
 5
    25th, two days before Thanksgiving?"
                    "Yes."
 6
7
                    "Under what circumstances?"
 8
                    "He ate dinner at my house."
 9
                    "You cooked dinner that night?"
10
                    "Uh-huh."
11
                    Still not paying attention to that yes or no
12
    thing.
13
                    "Do you recall what time it would have been
14
    that he was at your home?"
                    "The latest would have been about 6:00 or
15
           I alternated weeks. I worked either 9:00 to 6:00 or
16
    6:30.
17
    8:00 to 5:00, depending on what week it was. But it would
18
    have been 6:30 at the latest that he would have been there
19
    for dinner."
20
                    "Do you remember what you cooked?"
21
                    "Spaghetti."
22
                    "Did y'all eat dinner together then?"
23
                    "Yes."
24
                    "How long was he at your home?"
25
                    "Until 10:00."
```

56 1 "Do you know where he went after that?" 2 "Home." 3 So I'm an idiot, and this proves that I'm an I let them stand up here and arque that my client 4 5 was in Malakoff in the car an hour after she disappeared. 6 They've got to prove while in the course of committing, and 7 I just missed it. It went right between my legs, Bill 8 Buckner-style, for you baseball fans. 9 Did they ask him anything about the next day? 10 April Sikes asked, "Did you see Mr. Beatty on the 26th, the 11 day before Thanksgiving?" 12 "Yes." "Under what circumstances?" 13 14 "He brought me a turkey." 15 So all of the questions about the 25th and 16 the 26th and all of that business about him being in 17 Malakoff an hour, hour and a half afterwards, it's not true. She's mistaken, or she's lying. It doesn't make any 1.8 19 difference, and it's too late now for him to be guilty of 20 anything other than capital murder. But it's not too late. 21 I sat over on that side of the table and 22 heard Mr. Bingham say time and again that it doesn't make 23 any difference when he used the car. That's a slick lawyer trick. 24 25 Maybe the gist of my argument was lost.

57 1 Since the State has the burden of proving beyond a 2 reasonable doubt that the intent to commit the underlying 3 felony had been formulated at the same time or prior to the intent to commit the murder, my point was the fact that he 4 5 didn't use any of that stuff until days and days later 6 created a reasonable doubt about that. 7 You will understand -- and I'm going to talk 8 some more about this in a second -- but it's hard to sit 9 here and listen to a legitimate argument to be discounted as 10 a slick lawyer trick. And there was a big debate, and y'all 11 may remember this, about whether Carolyn Click told or asked 12 Tracy Beatty to leave. I know that y'all recall that. 13 Mr. Bingham stood up, because he gets to go 14 last and he's going to get to go last again today, and he 15 read part of the testimony to you. Part, the last part. 16 What he didn't read to you is this: August 2, 2004, Brett Harrison asked Betty McCarty, "Did she" -- talking about 17 18 Carolyn -- "indicate to you anything about her relationship 19 with Tracy Beatty at that time?" 20 "She was unhappy." Answer: 21 Question: "What did she tell you?" 22 "She was unhappy about it, and Answer: 23 had -- did he say I couldn't say what I interrupted?" 24 "Ma'am, you can." "She said she asked him to leave that day and 25

58 1 that she said 'I've put up with all I'm going to put up 2 with, and I had asked him to leave, ' and she was upset about 3 it, and that's the last time I saw her." Question by Mr. Harrison: "Did she tell you 4 5 what time that day she told Tracy Beatty to leave?" You can look, read, whatever you want, all 6 7 through there. The only one that ever said "told" was them. 8 The only one who ever said "kicked out" was them. Does that 9 make any difference? 10 Even if it didn't make any difference on whether or not it created a reasonable doubt about the case, 11 12 you have the right to consider all the evidence in the case 13 when deciding is there sufficient mitigation in the case 14 that warrants a life sentence rather than the death penalty 15 be imposed? 16 I'm not trying to trick you. I'm trying to 17 show you what the evidence in the case shows and point out 18 what it doesn't show. 19 What I want to talk about is, is this: 20 Ms. Sikes stands up and says there's no mitigation in the 21 case, not that it's insufficient, but there's just none at 22 all. This is Mr. One-Hundred-Percent-Evil; this is 23 Mr. Worthless. Those are words that I didn't choose. 24 That's the words chosen by the State of Texas, because it is 25 so much easier to get a jury to cash in somebody's chips and

get them out of the game from now on if they don't look at them as being human.

That human being, that child of God is the one who contacted law enforcement and told them, "I've got to tell them about some bodies that are buried." That was him. That human being is the one who led the police to his mother's body.

Now, does that give him the right to kill her in the first place? Of course not. Something being mitigating and something being a defense are two different things. It's apples and oranges.

She says there's nothing mitigating because it didn't give him the right to do it. That's like picking oranges off an apple tree. You're standing under the wrong tree, Ms. Sikes. He's the one that solved her disappearance. He's the one that contacted law enforcement. He's the one that led them to the body. He's the one that confessed to a murder that he didn't do and finally came around and told the truth about him killing his own mother.

Do you have a right to be mad at Tracy
Beatty? Yeah, Tracy Beatty is a dirtbag. He killed his own
unarmed mother in a violent fight, not to rob her, not to
burglarize her. I don't care what y'all said. Respect your
opinion and disagree with it. He murdered his mother.

And for murder or even murder, he could gone

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

60 to prison for the rest of his life, just like you can still They want to stand up and argue there's no way to ensure that guards would be safe if he was in TDC. Well, that's true. And there's no way to ensure that guards would be safe in TDC if he's not down there. There's no way to ensure that I'm going to be safe walking out to my car There's no way to ensure that when I go out to get today. the paper in the morning, I'm not going to get struck by lightning. There is the second fold in the way that they attack to try to get a death penalty case. They scare you. I'm scared of everything. It's that turtle mentality. Let's all duck up in the shell. Let's not live our lives because we're afraid of what might happen. And you know what? It's real easy to scare you of Tracy Beatty. Real easy. I mean, that's like shooting fish in a barrel. You know what was amazing to me? from TDC that came down here and talked about, because of their procedures, if you're convicted of capital murder, you don't automatically go to administrative segregation. know what? I live in this community. I'm a father. Ι wouldn't want Tracy Beatty anywhere around my daughter.

I mean, so what? He is never going to be

around her ever again. And after today, he will never be around me ever again. He will never be around Mr. Hawk ever again or any of these people or any of y'all ever again.

They want you to kill him because there's no safe place for him. And what's amazing -- I'm getting back to it -- what's amazing to me is that they won't put him straight in administrative segregation, but they can, and it has happened.

You can automatically go -- and I'm telling you, Ladies and Gentlemen, if there was ever a poster child for it, he's sitting right to Mr. Hawk's left. Got every qualification to go. Keep him by himself 24 hours a day except for the one hour a day he gets to go out into the dog run with two guards with him.

Can you protect those two guards from Tracy
Beatty and everybody else in the world? The answer is no.
I didn't see a special issue on that. That's not what the question is.

So when they get in here and tell you that there's not anything sufficiently mitigating, ask yourself this: Would Carolyn Click's body still be in that hole except for him leading law enforcement to it? Maybe, but no, he calls the cops and says there's bodies buried, leads them out there and shows them, because it's two days before Christmas and he says he wants his mother out of the hole

62 before Christmas. 1 2 But, see, you can't put anything in the 3 State's bank, because if you start doing that, if he starts getting any kind of credit at all, all of a sudden, he's not 4 5 100 percent evil. All of a sudden, he's not 100 percent worthless. All of a sudden, he's not the epitome of evil 6 7 that they want you to believe so you will help them kill 8 him. 9 Elevate yourself above the fray. We don't 10 have to dehumanize ourselves to deal with Tracy Beatty. 11 don't have to sink to his level to deal with him. This is 12 still a civilized society. 13 You know, I hate my job so much sometimes. It's unpleasant, distasteful, thankless. 14 It's about like 15 being on a jury, I suspect, probably. 16 What the State wants you to be able to do is, 17 is to say believe him when it's convenient for us, and let us call him a liar the whole rest of the time. 18 19 going to give you some examples of that, because it's kind 20 of like they're in a Chinese restaurant and they're ordering 21 like one off of menu A and one off of B and a couple from 22 over here. They're just all over the place with it. 23 Let me give you an example. When it's

convenient or helpful to the State, they want you to believe

"I'm in the Aryan Circle." Hey, believe it; it helps.

24

25

him.

63 1 He didn't have any tattoos or anything to show it, but he 2 said it on occasion. 3 How many other things has he said that they want you to disbelieve? Well, when he admitted to killing 4 his mother after a horrible fight, they don't want you to 5 6 believe that. We can't have you believe him then. 7 When he says to -- I don't even know what her 8 name was, his parole officer -- Simone Norman. Help me out. 9 Simone Norman. When she asked him, "Have you seriously 10 thought of killing somebody," and he says, "Yes," we want 11 you to believe that. 12 When he says to Betty McCarty, "I have until 13 December the 17th to be out of the house," they can't have 14 you believing that. 15 It's pick and choose, pick and choose. 16 the way to pick and choose is dehumanizing him. Pick and choose. Believe what's good for us; disbelieve everything 17 18 else. Follow us; we will never mislead you. 19 And so I don't blame them, and I said all along I didn't blame them for being mad at Tracy Beatty. 20 21 But when you let anger blur your vision as to what things 22 are, then it's a different story. 23 They want you to answer Special Issue Number 1 yes, and they want you to answer Special Issue 24 Number 1 no, because they know that that will ensure that 25

64 1 the Court will assess a death penalty against Tracy Beatty. 2 They want you to do that. 3 And these answers and stuff makes this thing 4 seem kind of surreal to me. Sometimes I'm standing here and 5 I think like -- do you ever get one of those out-of-body 6 kind of experiences where you're standing there and you're 7 like, I-can't-believe-the-stuff-that's-going-around-you kind 8 of feeling? 9 That's kind of the way that I feel as I stand 10 here right now. This is not pretend. It's not a game. 11 They are really and truly trying to get answers that will 12 result in him being executed, even though he led officers to 13 her body, even though he solved her disappearance, even though he confessed to killing her. 14 15 Each one of you -- there's 12 of you up there 16 on the jury, and every single one of y'all have the power by 17 yourselves to stop this. 18 The Court's charge, in paragraph 9, says that 19 you're instructed that any statements of counsel made during 20 the course of the trial, during argument which are not 21 supported by the evidence or statements of law made by 22 counsel not in harmony with the law, as stated to you by 23 Court, should be wholly disregarded. 24 Every single one of you have the power to 25 find mitigation in the case. Nobody can tell you what

mitigation is. Nobody, not even the Court, will tell you what sufficient mitigation is. It's whatever you think it is.

And I want to go back for a minute about talking about respecting other people's opinions. Your opinion is as important as yours, and yours is as important as yours, and yours is as important as his, and yours is as important as all of theirs, and yours matters just as much as anybody else, and yours makes all the difference, and yours is as important as anybody else on the jury, and so is yours and yours and yours.

Every single one of you have the power and the ability to just say no. Every single one of you have the power and the ability to just say yes.

When you get down to Special Issue Number 2, if you believe -- and this is the Court's instructions; this is not me with a slick lawyer trick; this is not me making something up; this is straight out of this charge. Every single last one of you have the power on Special Issue Number 2 to find sufficient mitigating circumstances and to hold fast to your convictions.

You know if that happens, the Court will impose a sentence of life imprisonment, and Tracy Beatty will go to prison and stay in prison until he is 83 years old, if he lives that long, before they ever even think

66 about paroling him. Some of you may be around, but I won't 1 2 have to worry about it. 3 And I'll tell you this: If the Parole Board wants to parole him, with his record, he's not ever going to 4 5 get out of prison. Judge, I'm going to object to 6 MR. BINGHAM: 7 that statement as a direct contradiction to the law. 8 There's no way to predict what the Parole Board will or will 9 not do. He's eligible in 40 years. 10 I'll rephrase it, Judge. MR. PERKINS: 11 THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Perkins. 12 MR. PERKINS: Statistically speaking, a white 13 male in this country lives to almost 80. It would take some 14 kind of trick for him to live long enough to ever be 15 eligible for parole. 16 The last topic I want to talk to you about is 17 this: I've already talked to you about each of y'all having 18 What I want to talk to you next about is, is the power. 19 having the great responsibility that comes along with that 20 And I don't know where this quote came from, but power. 21 "With great power comes great responsibility" is the way 22 that I remember it. 23 Each of you, as Ms. Sikes said, took an oath 24 to render a true verdict, so help you God. I know that 25 during voir dire, a lot of times the State or the Defense

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

1.2

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

67 would ask you how you felt about the death penalty, and they would ask if it was based on Biblical feelings or religious beliefs, the eye-for-an-eye thing. I feel compelled, given the questions that were asked in voir dire of you, to follow up on that. You've heard it said that eye for an eye, tooth for a tooth, but I'll tell you, "Do not resist an evil person. someone strikes you on the right cheek, turn to him the other also." An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth is not the way. And I'm going to disagree with Ms. Sikes when she says there's no greater love than the love of a mother for a child. I believe that there is a greater love than that, and I want to talk to you for a second about the concept of grace. Grace is not something that we earn by good deeds. Grace is not something that you lose by evil deeds. Grace is a gift that's given to the undeserving. Grace is something that he didn't show her. Grace is our salvation. Any one of you can answer yes on the last special issue. You have that absolute right. If you find a sufficient mitigating circumstance and you answer that last

special issue yes, Tracy Beatty will be sentenced to the penitentiary for life.

> I don't want you to cave in to pressure. Ι

68 1 don't want you to thirst after vengeance. Vengeance doesn't 2 belong to us. I want you to respect each other's opinions 3 and beliefs. 4 It's a terrible thing that Tracy Beatty did 5 to Carolyn Click, and he's robbed his family of her presence 6 as a mother and an aunt, cousin, sister, or grandmother. 7 And we've seen a lot of abbreviations over the last week go 8 up on this board. We've seen people write UCW and PCS and 9 all these abbreviations for all these crimes that Mr. Beatty 10 has committed in his life. 1.1 I've got one last thing to put up here, one 12 last abbreviation. Your oath is "so help you God." I don't 13 relish you the responsibility that you have to answer it. 14 That's the last abbreviation I want y'all to see before 15 y'all go back there and deliberate on what should be done. 16 We can deal with him without killing him. 17 Thank y'all. I really appreciate y'all's 18 time and attention. 19 Thank you, Mr. Perkins. THE COURT: 20 Mr. Bingham, 30 minutes. 21 MR. BINGHAM: Judge, may I have a call when I 22 have seven minutes remaining? 23 THE COURT: Yes. 24 MR. BINGHAM: The first thing I want to do is 25 tell you myself, again, how much I appreciate your service

in this case. And I'm going to talk a little bit about Mr. Perkins' arguments.

One thing that the Court has told you throughout this whole trial is you have to base your verdict on the evidence in the case. Let me give you a little something about -- and I've done a few of these trials. Let me tell you a little bit of something about the argument that Mr. Perkins is making.

I want to know where he stood up and argued the evidence to you about mitigation? Where? There wasn't one. Well, Mr. Perkins got up and said he's a child of God, and he is. He got up and said you are given grace, and I guess you are. And he asked you, what would Jesus do? Well, let me tell you -- let me address these as tactfully as I can.

Under his argument, no one would ever get the death penalty. Never. Let me tell you why. If all it took, if the status of the law in the State of Texas were, if you were a child of God, that is mitigation, you could never get the death penalty, the law in the State of Texas would not include the death penalty. Because everyone that commits a crime is a child of God.

That's not what the law says. The law says, base your verdict on the evidence in the case. Because let me tell you something. Carolyn Click turned her cheek, and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

70 she faced evil, and she paid for it. Because I will tell you one thing, Ladies and Gentlemen. When you go down there and you talk about Tracy Beatty, let me tell you what I'm not going to do. I'm not going to have a guard or his daughter come up here and ask me what he's doing back in the pen for 40 years. going to have a guard or his daughter come ask me where her daddy's at. Because I'll tell you something. He's a cold And when he put his hands around Carolyn Click's neck, he didn't think one time about being a child of God. That's not mitigation based on the evidence. Let me tell you something. What Mr. Perkins is getting up here and doing is saying everybody is a child of God; therefore, don't assess the death penalty.

argument is contrary to the state of the law in the State of Texas.

You know, Ladies and Gentlemen, for the next 40 years, that's why you have that special issue. if he goes down there for the next 40 years, what do you think he's going to do? He's going to terrorize, he's going to hurt, and he's going to victimize. That's why you have the special issue.

You want me to tell you-all what you need to look at? Look at all the evidence. Look at what he's done.

71 1 If you will hurt an 18-month-old baby and your own mom, 2 you'll hurt anybody. You look at the way that's sticking 3 out of that box. He's awaiting a capital murder trial in the Smith County Jail, and he makes that right there 4 5 (indicating) sticking out of that box. 6 Because I'll tell you this: He is a future 7 danger, he's a killer, and he's gonna continue to be that. 8 You know, Mr. Perkins talks about he's not a hundred percent 9 evil; he's not a hundred percent worthless. 10 I'll tell you, for 20 years, he's hurt 11 people. I want to know when the rights of people not to be 1.2 victimized -- when do the rights of people not to be hurt by 13 Tracy Beatty become paramount to his rights? When do we 14 finally say, "Enough, Tracy Beatty; we have tried everything 15 with you; we have put you in jail; we have put you in the 16 pen; we have put you on probation; we have put you on 17 parole"? You know, his conduct never changes. 18 And then Mr. Perkins tries another argument. 19 Mr. Perkins tries this argument: "Oh, I'm bad, and I'm 20 I missed it." He didn't miss anything. dumb. Let me 21 explain something to you, just to address these things 22 because you never know what you're going to go back there 23 and talk about. 24 4:00 o'clock -- and I'm not going to spend 25 much time on it because I don't want to get off on a rabbit

72 1 trail. 4:00 o'clock, she comes over and talks to Betty 2 McCarty, the victim does. 3 5:30 -- 5:00 to 5:30, he's in Malakoff. 4 Stacey Killough tells you it takes 30, 45 minutes to get 5 there. 6 6:30, he's back at Lieanna Wilkerson's house. 7 And what does she tell you here? "He only stays at my house 8 a few minutes. I'm trying to get my kids ready to go to 9 Killeen." You didn't miss anything. That's exactly what the evidence shows. But what he's trying to get you to do 10 11 is say, "Oh, God, it couldn't -- what if we missed 12 something? That's mitigation." 13 That's not mitigation. Understand something, 14 mitigation is based on not what ifs or what could have been. 15 You heard the evidence, you deliberated, and you found --16 and you made the right decision. 17 Let me show you something else. I'm just 18 going to hold it up as I read it so everybody can finally 19 put this to rest. "Her words to me that afternoon is, 'I 20 told Tracy to leave today.'" 21 "Now, Ms. McCarty, I know that it's hard to 22 remember exactly what was said, but isn't it true that 23 before lunch, you said that she asked him to leave? Didn't 24 you say that?" 25 "I might have used that phrase, but I

73 1 remember what I've been telling all along is she told him to 2 leave that day." 3 Look, Mr. Perkins doesn't have any 4 mitigation. He knows there's not any based on the evidence. 5 What did you hear in the evidence? You don't go back there as a jury and say, "Well, I'm just going to give him a life 6 7 I'm going to answer the special issues in such a 8 way that he gets a life sentence just on the off chance 9 maybe I heard something wrong." That's contrary to the law. 10 Or "I'm going to go back there and give him a 11 life sentence because he is a child of God." Every criminal 12 defendant is. Understand, I'm not trying to lessen that or 13 be disrespectful, but that's not the evidence in the case. 14 If you really were going to do what 15 Mr. Perkins was going to ask you to do, you really would 16 have not been fit to sit on this jury, because every 17 criminal defendant would always get a life sentence. 18 I'll tell you something. I'm not going to shed a tear for 19 that defendant, but I'm going to reflect on what he's done, 20 what he's chosen to do, and what he will do. 21 And I'll tell you this: Do any of y'all 22 really believe that we haven't proven that probably Tracy 23 Beatty will continue to commit criminal acts of violence that will constitute a continuing threat to society? 24

there anyone who really believes that the evidence doesn't

25

show that here? Really?

1.8

Is there anyone that really thinks that there's any mitigation in Tracy Beatty's life sufficient to warrant life over death? Really?

Because you understand something. Tracy
Beatty did what he did. He didn't have to take that little
18-month-old and do what he did to her, and he didn't have
to kill his mother, and he didn't have to use dope all those
years, and he didn't have to beat her up and get his parole
revoked and come back out when she gave him a second chance
and kill her.

You see, he didn't have to do all of that and then somehow want to make you feel guilty for something.

What do you have to feel guilty for? Your job as jurors in this case is serious. You know why it's serious? Because he's gonna -- Tracy Beatty is gonna encounter a guard in TDC, and for the next 40 years, knowing that he doesn't look at parole until he's 82, what do you think he's going to go down there and do? What do you think he's going to go down there and do?

So instead of reflecting on Tracy Beatty, why don't you -- why don't you focus on his past victims and the future victims to come. And why don't you say to him enough. Enough. Because I'll tell you something. I'm not gonna have a mother or daughter come to me and ask me about

their father who was a guard because I know what he's gonna to do. He made that shank just a month or so ago, just a month or so ago.

Mr. Perkins' arguments are arguments when they don't have any -- when they want to get you off on the fact that they have no evidence in mitigation. None. There is no mitigation in this case, much less any sufficient to warrant life over death. So they make the argument to you, well, he's a child of God.

The death penalty is not contrary to the law of God. And your duty, the oath you took before God, was to base your verdict on the evidence. And if you based your verdict on giving a life sentence because he's a child of God, then no one on this jury would be fit to serve as a jury in a criminal case in the State of Texas because every defendant would automatically get a life sentence. It's just that simple.

And I'll tell you this: This argument that Mr. Perkins makes, "Well, you know, I missed some things," he didn't miss anything. Mr. Perkins is a brilliant lawyer. He's smart enough to get up and try to put some doubt in your mind over in the guilt/innocence evidence as if to say, "Now, if you have anything, just call it a wash and give him a life sentence."

The fact that you deliberated your verdict is

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

76 You did what you were supposed to do as not evidence. You don't convict beyond all doubt. believe the defendant is quilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Understand something. The law recognizes that you can and will have some doubt. That's why we don't have to prove it to you beyond all doubt. If that doubt is considered as mitigation, then a defendant could never get the death penalty. You see how that works? We don't have to prove it to you beyond all doubt, and the fact you have doubt is not evidence. That's deliberation. And if that was the standard, as Mr. Perkins has detailed to you, we could never get the death penalty on a defendant in the State of Texas ever. Understand, this is serious, and it is. Mr. Perkins talks about we're trying to kill the defendant. You know what? I didn't electrocute an 18-month-old baby; I didn't kill my mother; I didn't use dope and neither did He did. And he should be held accountable for that.

And when he goes down to the system that's been unable to change his conduct for 20 years, for 20 years, and that guard that's down there is going down there to make a living to support his family, pulls him out of there and that happens to him, that's why you look at future danger, and you say no more. No more.

Let me ask you this: What more could he do that you haven't heard? What more could the State have brought you in this case than you heard? What more? Been on parole, been on probation, been to the pen, been to jail, and while he's awaiting charges, he makes a shank.

He kills his own mother. He electrocutes an 18-month-old, who gets to go to the closet and cuddle up as she bleeds. And a guard that walks up to him and says, "Get a haircut," just like that (snaps fingers).

And then Mr. Perkins comes in and makes arguments he knows are contrary to the law. Well, I'll tell you this: When you go back and you give him a life sentence because he's a child of God, I'm not explaining it, because that's not the law. And if that was the standard that the law had, no one would ever get it. And it's not the law, and Mr. Perkins knows it.

You know, Ladies and Gentlemen, you've heard the evidence, and you're going to do what you're going to do in this case, but you have something that is so important to you in your deliberation. You have the past, which is the best predictor of the future, and you have something only a month ago.

Because you look at those -- you look out at -- you look at these guards sitting out here, and you think about those young guards down there working in TDC.

78 1 Some of them -- some of them are not honest people. Many of 2 them are as hard-working, family-oriented, and caring as 3 you'll ever find, down there doing a job that I can't even imagine. 4 5 And I'll tell you something. They're 6 entitled to protection. If you believe the evidence shows 7 that there is a probability, that he will probably continue to commit criminal acts of violence that will constitute a 8 9 continuing threat to society, you took an oath to answer 10 yes. And if you don't find there's sufficient mitigation to 11 warrant a life sentence over death, which there's clearly 12 not, you took an oath to answer no. 13 Understand something. I'm not killing the 14 defendant. You, by your verdict, if it was yes or no, are 15 not killing him. You're answering special issues based on 16 the evidence. It just -- it amazes me that he will do the 17 things he's done, hurt the people he's hurt, and then come 18 in here and say do some kind of -- "Oh, well, yeah, but you 19 It's your fault. It's your fault. It's your 20 fault. You're trying to kill me. It's your fault." 21 Where were the --22 MR. PERKINS: Judge, can we approach the 23 bench? 24 (At the bench, on the record.) 25 MR. PERKINS: Judge, I'm going to object to

79 1 the last comment as a direct comment on the defendant's 2 failure to testify in either phase of the trial. 3 The prosecutor said that the defendant --"It's amazing the defendant did this, did this, and then 4 5 would come in here and say" is a direct comment on his 6 failure to testify. I would ask for an instruction to the 7 jury to disregard in its entirety the last comment made by 8 the prosecutor in his argument. 9 MR. BINGHAM: Judge, this is in direct 10 response to the Defense's closing argument. It's not a 11 comment on the defendant's right not to testify. I, in no 1.2 way, made a comment on his right to testify. It's in direct 13 response to his argument. 14 MR. PERKINS: He said -- he made a specific 15 reference to the defendant. He said that the defendant 16 would do the things that he did and then come in here and 17 say -- I'm telling you, Judge. That's exactly what he said. 18 MR. BINGHAM: I was referring to the 19 Defense's argument, Judge. 20 THE COURT: The Court considers it a response 21 to the argument made by defense counsel, and the Court's 22 going to overrule the objection. 23 (End of bench conference.) 24 MR. BINGHAM: And let me clear up something. 25 The evidence in this case has proved -- has shown no

mitigation. Go back there and look at what it says. It says, taking into consideration — because that's the gist of the Defense's argument. They made no argument that he was not a future danger. He is. They came up and said, well, he's a child of God; that is mitigation. Grace; that's mitigation.

Let me show you something. Taking into consideration all of the evidence, all of the evidence, including the circumstances of the offense, the defendant's character and background, and the personal moral culpability of the defendant. See what the law is asking you to do? Base your verdict on the evidence in the case.

Every defendant is a child of God. The State's entitled to a fair trial, and it's entitled to a jury that renders their verdict based on the evidence and the oath you took as jurors. We know it's a hard job you've got. It is. You didn't ask for it, and we know that.

But understand something. You didn't do the things that brought us here today. He did. He's a cold-blooded killer. He doesn't think twice about his victims. He doesn't. He took that 18-month-old baby -- don't you know she cried when he stuck that to her belly? She was so scared, as a year-and-a-half-old, that she crawled in that closet and cuddled up and bleed (sic).

What do you feel for him? He put his hands

around his mother's neck, and he looked her in the eye, and he killed her. And when he goes down to the pen, if you give him a life sentence, he's going to hurt somebody else because that's what he does. He feels no remorse for what he does. He doesn't think the rules apply to him. He's a killer.

Ladies and Gentlemen, you've got to base your verdict on the evidence in the case, just like the special issues say. You -- I'm not going to go back through the evidence. You go back there and remember and you think about the arguments in this case. It's based on the evidence in the case.

We know it's -- we know your job is serious.

I submit that your job is difficult in that the decisions

you make are serious. But on the evidence you must

consider, your decision should be pretty clear in this case.

I want to tell you, Mr. Perkins said, "Switch sides of the table with me." Well, you know something? I'm sitting on the prosecution side of the table. I'm the elected district attorney in this county. And I know who killed, and I know who was killed.

And if you want a tremendous responsibility in a case, as Mr. Perkins says, it's sitting next to this defendant. I disagree. What is the tremendous responsibility is to make jurors understand it's not whether

you're a child of God. It's to base it on the evidence.

And if you want a tremendous responsibility, talk to the family of Carolyn Click, who didn't kill anyone. And if you want a tremendous responsibility, go back to your office up on the fourth floor and sit in the chair and worry about those guards who are going to have to encounter this defendant over the next 40 years.

You base your verdict, Ladies and Gentlemen, on the evidence. Mr. Perkins told you he's brutal, and he's vicious, and he's a career criminal, and he doesn't respect life. The Defense's own words ought to answer that first special issue for you.

And then they give you the arguments to get you off point that aren't the evidence in the case, because there is no mitigation sufficient to warrant life over death. What mitigation could there be when you read the special issue?

And when you go back to answer it, read it.

Taking into consideration all of the evidence. What

evidence did you hear? Not argument of counsel, not child

of God, not grace. But what evidence did you hear from that

witness stand right there that was mitigating and reduced

the blameworthiness of this defendant sufficient to warrant

life over death? What? That's what the law says.

And I know this is emotional for y'all. I

look out there, and I see the Kleenexes. And you know what I hope, though? I hope -- and I don't know why there's -- I don't specifically what's in your minds. But I hope that when you go back there, that you feel as heart felt for the victims of Tracy Beatty as you do for Tracy Beatty, if you do for him at all.

And I hope when you go back there and you deliberate this case, that you look forward, that you look at what he's done in the past, that you look at what he's done in the past, and you look forward to the future in determining whether he's a future danger.

Because somebody's life may depend on it.

Because I'll tell you something. There's no rolling back

time. When Tracy Beatty goes down to the pen and he hurts

somebody, and he's gonna, you know, we don't get to come

back in here and rewind what we've done. This is it right

now.

So base your verdict on the evidence. And you remember something. He made his choices, and he did it. What you're doing back there is following the law and answering the special issues based on the law. Don't make any apologies for him. Don't feel any guilt for what he did. You understand that you're following the law in the case and basing your verdict on the evidence.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm gonna sit down.

84 And I know you're tired, and I know you've heard the 1 2 I will submit to you that this case cries for the 3 death penalty, and it does to this extent: That the 4 evidence clearly shows beyond a reasonable doubt that he 5 would probably continue to commit criminal acts of violence 6 that would constitute a continuing threat to society. 7 My God, you just have to look to what he's 8 done in the past, what he did only a month or so ago, what 9 the doctors told you. And as you look at the evidence, after you've answered that one yes, and you go down to the 10 11 mitigation, you ask yourself, based on the evidence, what 12 did you hear that was sufficient to warrant life over death? 13 What did you hear from the witness stand? That's what you base your verdict on in this case. 14 15 Thank y'all very much. 16 Thank you, Mr. Bingham. THE COURT: 17 Ladies and Gentlemen, you will now retire to 18 the jury room to consider your verdict in the case, the 19 charge of Court, as you well know, will come in with you. If you do need additional copies of the charge of the Court, 20 21 if you'll notify the bailiff, he'll advise the Court, and 22 I'll have additional copies delivered in to you. 23 You will retire now for your deliberations. 24 All rise for the jury. 25 (The jury leaves the courtroom.)

```
85
 1
                    (Open court, defendant present, no jury.)
 2
                    THE COURT: All right. We'll be in recess
 3
    waiting for the jury.
 4
                    (Jury deliberations.)
 5
                    (The jury enters the courtroom.)
 6
                    (Open court, defendant and jury present.)
 7
                    THE COURT: Be seated, please.
                                                    Thank you.
 8
                    On the record in Cause Number 241-0978-04,
 9
    the State of Texas versus Tracy Beatty. The record should
    reflect that State's counsel is present; the defense counsel
10
11
    is present; the defendant is present; and the members of the
12
    jury are present and seated in the courtroom.
13
                    Mr. Harris, I received a note from you that
14
    the jury had reached a verdict in this case; is that
15
    correct?
16
                    THE PRESIDING JUROR:
                                          Yes, Your Honor.
17
                    THE COURT:
                               Mr. Foreman, have you completed
18
    the certificate, which is at the very end of the charge, the
19
    last page in the charge?
20
                    THE PRESIDING JUROR: Yes, Your Honor.
21
                                All right, sir. Would you hand
                    THE COURT:
22
    the verdict, please, to the bailiff for delivery to the
23
    Court?
24
                    (The verdict is handed to the bailiff.)
25
                    THE COURT:
                                All right.
                                            If the defendant
```

86 1 would rise at this time. 2 THE DEFENDANT: (Complies.) THE COURT: In Cause Number 241-0978-04, the 3 State of Texas versus Tracy Beatty, the Court has received 4 5 the following answers to the special issues contained in the 6 verdict form provided to the jury at the beginning of 7 deliberations. 8 "Special Issue Number 1: Is there a 9 probability that the defendant, Tracy Beatty, would commit 10 criminal acts of violence that would constitute a continuing 11 threat to society?" 12 Answer to Special Issue Number 1: 13 jury, unanimously find and determine beyond a reasonable 14 doubt that the answer to this Special Issue Number 1 is 15 'yes,'" signed Mitchell Harris, Foreman. 16 "Special Issue Number 2: Taking into 17 consideration all of the evidence, including the 18 circumstances of the offense, the defendant's character and 19 background, and the personal, moral culpability of the 20 defendant, is there sufficient mitigating circumstance or 21 circumstances to warrant that a sentence of life 22 imprisonment rather than a death sentence be imposed?" 23 Answer to Special Issue Number 2: "We, the 24 jury, unanimously find and determine that the answer to this 25 Special Issue Number 2 is 'no,'" signed by the Foreman of

87 1 the Jury, Mitchell Harris. 2 Jury certificate: "We, the jury, return in 3 open court the above answer or answers as our answer or answers to the special issue or special issues submitted to 4 5 us and the same is our verdict in this case," signed by 6 Mitchell Harris, Foreman of the Jury. 7 Let me ask the jury and each member of the 8 jury at this time, if the verdict that the Court just read 9 and the answers to the special issues contained in the 10 verdict form that the Court just read is your verdict, would 11 you so signify by raising your right hand? 12 (The jury complies.) 13 THE COURT: The record should reflect that all 12 members of the jury have raised their right hand. 14 15 Thank you. 16 Is there any request from the State, 17 Mr. Bingham, to have the jury individually polled? 18 MR. BINGHAM: There's not. 19 THE COURT: Is there any request from the 20 Defense, Mr. Perkins, to have the jury individually polled? 21 MR. PERKINS: No, Your Honor. 22 The Court, then, does, having THE COURT: 23 reviewed the verdict form as returned to the Court by the 24 jury, the Court does accept the verdict, has received the 25 verdict, and will order it filed among the papers of the

88 1 cause with the clerk of the Court to note the time it was 2 received by the Court upon the verdict form. 3 Mr. Bingham, on behalf of the State, is there any legal reason that you know why the Court should not now 4 5 at this time discharge the jury? 6 I don't know of any, Judge. MR. BINGHAM: 7 THE COURT: Mr. Perkins, any legal reason, 8 then, that you would have to offer as to why at this time 9 the jury should not be discharged? 10 MR. PERKINS: Without waiving any previous 11 objections that the Defense made to the sentencing 12 procedures, sentencing scheme, or any other objection that 13 we have to evidence, there's no additional legal reason at 14 bar, Your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Perkins. 16 Ladies and Gentlemen of the Jury, upon 17 receiving your verdict, which has been read by the Court and 18 which you have all signified by raising your right hand that 19 it is the individual verdict of each one of you, 12 jurors, 20 the Court will now be able to discharge you from jury 21 service in this case and release you from all of the 22 instructions previously given to you by the Court. 23 that you are you free to talk about this case now to anyone 24 that you wish to discuss it with. 25 At the same time, you do not have to discuss

this case with any individual. Occasionally, after jury service, you may be asked to give an affidavit regarding your jury service. You are free to give the affidavit; you are free to decline to give any affidavit. In other words, you can talk to whoever you want to about this case, or you don't have to talk to anyone about this case. That's a personal, private decision that you are entitled to make and that each one of you will make yourselves.

You will make the decision as to whether or not you want to discuss the case with anyone as to whether or not you want to give an affidavit if you're asked to do so. You can discuss the case with anyone you want to, or you can decline to discuss the case with anyone that you do not want to talk to about it. That is each one of your individual decisions to make.

The Court wants to thank you for all of the time that you have invested in this case. The Court is well aware that, certainly, this type case where it is a capital murder case and where the State is seeking the death penalty is a case where, although all jury service is jury duty, certainly when you serve on this type case, going through the individual voir dire examination and then going through the trial itself, including the special issues which have to be answered in a case such as this, the Court is well aware that this is really jury service above and beyond the call

of duty, and it is jury duty.

And for those of us who have been in the criminal justice system for a long time and have chosen it as a profession in various capacities, we work in the system every day. Just about everyone involved in this case has been in the criminal justice system for a long time.

I think what is especially important and we remember and I would want to say to you is that it is individuals such as yourself who are chosen through the designed process to serve on a jury in this case, a capital murder jury, where the State was seeking the death penalty, that perform the most important function in our criminal justice system.

It goes without saying that the system would not work without your service. It's clear to this Court that you have all closely followed the Court's instructions, all followed the law as given to you in the Court's charge. You have been a very attentive jury. Where I am sitting here, it's been very clear to me that you have all paid very close attention to all of the testimony of the witnesses and the exhibits as they came in before you in this trial.

The Court certainly recognizes that this is difficult jury service that you have just performed. At the same time, our system, as it is designed to work, simply could not function without individuals such as you. And you

have the Court's deep appreciation for all the time that you have put in individually in this case. I'm very aware that you have all had to make sacrifices individually from a businesses standpoint or of a personal standpoint to be down through the evidence in this trial all the way down to the verdict that you've rendered and returned into court today.

So on behalf of the Court, and I know on behalf of the State and the Defense, you have our deep appreciation for the service that you have rendered in this case.

It has been said, and I think -- we often think in terms of military duty, and certainly at this time that our country is engaged around the world, certainly at this particular time with so many men and women so far away from home in conflict, I think it's extremely important and I know that you do and we all recognize and everyone recognize that one of the primary rights that those soldiers are fighting for is what just took place over the last two weeks of evidence coming in, a case tried in as careful and diligent a manner as it could be done, both the State and Defense represented by very able and capable, especially experienced, lawyers.

As a judge, we try to make the best rulings that we can based on what we believe the law to be. But in the final analysis, it is certainly your service that is,

basically, the cog in the wheel that makes the wheels of justice in our criminal justice system work.

And, again, I just want to express to you -I know the sequestration order also, I'm sure, caused some
difficult and hardship. It's not one the Court likes to
have to enter, but in a case such as this, it normally has
to be done at some point.

Again, you have the Court's deep appreciation for your service. The Court is going to be able to excuse you at this time.

I will say to you that if you have in regard to your service, any suggestions, any complaints, any way you think that we could do a better job of accommodating you while you're here in jury duty during a trial, feel free to call me and let me know. Feel free to call my staff and let them know.

I certainly know that one of the most frustrating things to a jury is down through a lengthy trial, as this was, that many times you are out of the courtroom more than you would understand why you were out of the courtroom. In other words, that you're out of the courtroom probably it seems to you too many times.

And we're working in here in the courtroom.

We're taking up matters outside of your presence that under
the law have to be taken up outside of your presence. But

1.8

at the same time, I know that's frustrating. That's just part of the way our system works and part of what we have to go through to ensure a fair and impartial trial. Although I know it's frustrating to you, I hope you understand it's part of our process.

You have been a very patient jury. You have fulfilled, in the Court's assessment, the duty in this case to the highest standards that we can expect from jurors. So with that, the Court will, at this time, excuse you, release you from the instructions of the Court.

And let me say to you that what we're going to try to do is the deputies will go down with you, take you down to the grand jury room where you've been for a good period of time. I know that you have belongings here, personal belongings, like up in the van. I think that some of you may need to make telephone calls.

Carleton will be going back down with you, as well as other bailiffs, and you will be able to make whatever telephone calls you need to make, if someone is coming to pick you up. Once all of those arrangements are made and we are in a position to, then you will be able to go ahead and have someone pick you up and leave with them or deputies will escort you out to your vehicles, out to your cars, to leave.

There will be in the courtroom a formal

94 1 sentencing process that will take place. Certainly, any of 2 you that want to, you can be present for that formal 3 sentencing process, if you wish to wait and see that process take place. At the same time, we have made the arrangements 4 5 where we can get you on down to the grand jury room where 6 you can get everything done you personally need to get done, 7 where you can be picked up or be escorted to your car just 8 as soon as possible. 9 And as soon as -- we'll have it where you can 10 go ahead and make the calls. And then as soon as we can get 11 you on out to your cars and to be picked up, we will do 12 If you will bear with us down there just a little bit 13 longer as soon as we can, that will all be done. 14 So at this time, again, with the Court's deep 15 appreciation, you may be excused down to the grand jury room 1.6 where deputies will be with you until all the matters can be 17 taken care of, and then you can leave in your cars with the bailiff escort or individuals that can be called to come on 18 19 down and pick you up. 20 All rise for the jury. 21 (The jury leaves the courtroom.) 22 (Open court, defendant present, no jury.) 23 MR. BINGHAM: May I approach? 24 (At the bench, on the record.) 25 MR. BINGHAM: I was asking about him talking

	95
1	about their jury service. He actually said that.
2	(End of bench conference.)
3	THE COURT: Ladies and Gentlemen, thank you
4	very much.
5	You can be excused at this time.
6	MR. BINGHAM: I apologize, Judge. I missed
7	that.
8	THE COURT: Be seated.
9	That's okay.
10	All right. At this time, we will proceed
11	with the formal pronouncement of sentence. If the defendant
12	will stand.
13	THE DEFENDANT: (Complies.)
14	THE COURT: On behalf of the State, is there
15	anything you have to present before the Court formally
16	pronounces the sentence, Mr. Bingham?
17	MR. BINGHAM: Your Honor, we do not.
18	THE COURT: On behalf of the defendant,
19	Mr. Perkins, is there any legal reason you wish to offer at
20	bar as to why the sentence should not now formally be
21	pronounced?
22	MR. HAWK: Yes, Judge. On behalf of the
23	defendant, we would renew all of the objections that we made
24	to the capital sentencing scheme and renew our request of
25	the Court to set side the capital sentence and verdict as

96 1 well as all the motions we filed. 2 We ask and reurge at this time for the Judge 3 to void the verdict of the jury and prevent the imposition 4 of the death penalty for the reasons enumerated in those 5 motions. We wish to preserve each error and ask the Court at this time to rule on each of the requests made prior to 6 7 this time before the sentencing. THE COURT: 8 In regard to the sentencing 9 scheme? 10 MR. HAWK: All of the motions we've made with 11 regard to the capital sentencing scheme? 12 THE COURT: Which the Court has previously ruled on? 13 14 MR. HAWK: You have. 15 THE COURT: The Court's rulings on all of 16 those motions regarding the capital sentencing scheme that 17 the Court has earlier denied are denied again. 18 Thank you, Judge. MR. HAWK: 19 THE COURT: Therefore, at this time, the 20 Court, finding no legal reason at bar, Mr. Beatty, pursuant 21 to the jury's verdict in this case finding you guilty of the 22 offense of capital murder, as alleged by the State in its 23 indictment, and the jury having found you quilty of the 24 offense of capital murder and pursuant to the jury's 25 verdict, answering the special issues in this cause, Special

Issue Number 1 where the jury found that unanimously beyond a reasonable doubt that the answer to Special Issue Number 1 is "yes," and the jury having answered Special Issue Number 2 unanimously, and the jury having found that the answer to Special Issue Number 2 unanimously was "no," and is "no," based upon those answers to the special issues submitted to the jury and the jury's earlier verdict finding you guilty of the offense of capital murder, pursuant to the provisions of Texas law, the Constitution of Texas and of the United States, and the Court having accepted these verdicts of the jury and have them filed among the papers of the cause, the Court, at this time, does sentence you, pursuant to law, to death by lethal injection.

In connection with this sentence of death, there is a mandatory appeal direct to the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals, the Court of Criminal Appeals of the State of Texas.

The Court, in connection with the sentencing, does not at this time set an execution date. Texas law requires that although the sentence of death has now been pronounced by the Court that you do have an automatic mandatory appeal. That automatic mandatory appeal will take place. The transcript records and all of those documents will be prepared, the court reporter's record, the clerk's record, and briefs filed.

98 1 The Texas Court of Criminal Appeals will then 2 hear the case and issue their decision. If they issue a 3 mandate back to this Court affirming the judgment and sentence of the Court, then this Court would, pursuant to 4 5 Texas law, proceed with setting a date of execution. 6 There's also a separate appellate procedure; 7 that is an 11.071 writ of habeas corpus procedure. 8 collateral appeal that is provided for by Texas law, 9 mandated by Texas law, to be provided you and sanctioned --10 has been sanctioned by the Federal courts. 11 If you are too poor or too indigent to hire a 12 lawyer to represent you in connection with the direct appeal 13 and in connection with the 11.071 writ of habeas corpus 14 appeal, this Court will, at your request, appoint counsel to 15 represent you in those proceedings. 16 Are you requesting counsel in that regard, 17 Mr. Beatty? 18 MR. HAWK: Just one moment. We're having a 19 conference. 20 Mr. Hawk, perhaps -- I'm sorry. THE COURT: 21 The Court -- well, go ahead, Mr. Hawk. I'll hear what you 22 have to say. 23 MR. HAWK: Because there are two parallel 24 appellate mechanisms at this time, Mr. Beatty does not 25 immediately request counsel on his 11.071 writ, but we will

99 address with the Court and would ask the Court at the 1 conclusion of this proceeding to entertain a matter for 2 3 Mr. Perkins and myself regarding his direct appeal. In that matter, what the Court THE COURT: 4 would do, Mr. Hawk and Mr. Perkins, is simply require you to 5 continue to serve in your capacity as counsel for the 6 defendant to inform him fully about the appellate processes 7 and appellate rights. And then if there's going to be an 8 application for court-appointed counsel, then I -- the Court 9 would request that you get the necessary affidavit of 10 indigency filed. 11 And the Court would then make an appointment 12 of counsel off the affidavit of indigency, so I'm, 13 basically, just going to continue your representation, if 14 not further, but certainly at this point through advising 15 him of his appellate rights and the procedures involved in 16 the appellate rights and to assist the Court in terms of if 17 there's going to be a filing of an indigency affidavit so 18 that the Court can appoint other counsel, if there's going 19 to be other counsel. 20 Just one moment, Judge. MR. HAWK: 21 THE COURT: Mr. Hawk, I'm talking in terms of 22 23 the direct appeal. And, Judge, here's what I MR. HAWK: Right. 24 Because of the matters raised suspect we're going to do. 25

and motions for new trial, if there is one filed, may bear not only on the the merits of the case in chief and all the matters that occurred during the course of trial, but may also directly reflect upon the performance of counsel who's appointed at trial.

We are anticipating to be filing a motion with the Court to withdraw from the cause so that counsel can be appointed for Mr. Beatty on his direct appeal to be in a position with sufficient time to file a motion for new trial and has an adequate opportunity to address issues associated with effective representation.

MR. PERKINS: In the meanwhile, Judge, obviously we have no objection to continuing our duty to advise him as to his appellate rights and the timelines associated therein.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Perkins.

Then if the -- Mr. Perkins and Mr. Hawk, I will continue you in the capacity of representing the defendant for the purpose of what the Court has outlined here subsequent to the assessment and pronouncement of sentence.

Once the Court has received a mandate affirming the judgment and sentence of the Court and an order that denies the application from writ of habeas corpus from the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals, if the Court

101 receives both the mandates, then at that time, pursuant to 1 2 Texas law, Mr. Beatty, you would be returned back to this 3 Court, and at that time, the Court would set a date of 4 execution pursuant to the statutes and the law of the State 5 of Texas. 6 You've been represented by Mr. Perkins and 7 Mr. Hawk, your attorneys. Do you have any problems or any 8 complaints whatsoever with the representation that Mr. Hawk 9 and Mr. Perkins have provided you in this case? 10 THE DEFENDANT: No. 11 THE COURT: Sir? 12 THE DEFENDANT: No, sir. 13 The Court, then, does formally THE COURT: 14 pronounce the sentence. The jury having found you guilty of 15 capital murder and based on the jury's answers to Special 16 Issue Number 1 and Special Issue Number 2 submitted to the 17 jury in this case, the Court does pronounce the sentence as 18 death by lethal injection. 19 You may be seated at this time. 20 (Complies.) THE DEFENDANT: 21 THE COURT: Mr. Bingham, we're going to 22 proceed at this time pursuant to Texas Constitution, 23 victim's rights legislation, to take up any victim-impact 24 testimony. 25 MR. BINGHAM: Yes, sir.

,	
	102
1	THE COURT: Victim's statement.
2	MR. BINGHAM: Yes, sir.
3	THE COURT: Which, as you know, is not
4	recorded on the record, but any statements that victims wish
5	to make.
6	MR. BINGHAM: Judge, we do have three of the
7	victim's family members that wish to give statements. We
8	have informed them of the protocol, which that is done, and
9	would only inquire of the Court whether the Court wants to
10	take the witness stand or where they are is their choice.
11	THE COURT: I believe they can come around,
12	Mr. Bingham, to the witness stand.
13	(Victim-impact statements.)
14	MR. BINGHAM: Judge, that concludes the
15	victim-impact testimony.
16	THE COURT: Back on the record in Cause
17	241-0978-04, the State of Texas versus Tracy Beatty, the
18	State being present; defense counsel present; the defendant
19	is present.
20	Is there anything further, Mr. Bingham, on
21	behalf of the State?
22	MR. BINGHAM: No, Your Honor.
23	THE COURT: Is there anything further,
24	Mr. Perkins, on behalf of the Defense?
25	MR. PERKINS: Not at this time, Your Honor.

```
103
                    THE COURT: Then the Court -- Mr. Beatty, you
 1
 2
    will be remanded in the custody of the Smith County
 3
    Sheriff's Department until such time as you can be
 4
    transported to the Texas Department of
 5
    Corrections-Institutional Division for the sentence of the
 6
    Court to be carried out.
 7
                    We'll be in recess.
 8
                    (End of proceedings.)
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

104 1 STATE OF TEXAS 2 COUNTY OF SMITH * 3 We, STEVE R. AWBREY, CSR, Official Court Reporter, and 4 KIM CHRISTOPHER, CSR, RPR, Deputy Official Court Reporter, 5 for the 241st Judicial District Court in Smith County, 6 Texas, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing 7 contains a true and correct transcription of all of the 8 proceedings in the foregoing styled and numbered cause, all 9 of which occurred in open court or in chambers and were 10 reported by us. 11 We further certify that this transcription of the 12 record of the proceedings truly and correctly reflects the 13 exhibits, if any, offered by the respective parties. Witness our hand this the 19 day of 14 ___, 2005. 15 16 17 18 19 KIM CHRISTOPHER, STEVE R. AWBREY, CSR CSR, RPR 20 Texas CSR Number 4219 Texas CSR Number 3940 12-31-06 Expiration date: 12-31-05 Expiration date: 21 Deputy Official Reporter Deputy Official Reporter 241st Judicial District Court 241st Judicial District Court Smith County, Texas 22 Smith County, Texas 100 North Broadway, Room 304 100 North Broadway, Room 221 23 75702 Tyler, Texas 75702 Tyler, Texas Telephone: (903) 535-0575 Telephone: (903) 535-0603 24 25